

signers; Mrs. Camille M. R. De Bow, of Bloomingdale, N. J., and 155 signers; Mrs. Eva N. Taylor, of Rutherford, N. J., and 296 signers; Eliza M. Beck, of Hackettstown, N. J., and 140 signers; Ola H. Roe, of Newton, N. J., and 143 signers; Percival Clow, of Ridgewood, N. J., and 51 signers; total signatures 1,578, all residents of the sixth congressional district of New Jersey, protesting against any modification of the Federal prohibition act, and particularly opposed to any legislation authorizing alcoholic contents of 2.75 per cent in beverages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2491. By Mr. SITES: Petition of the Order of Railroad Telegraphers, Pennsylvania System, Division No. 17, approximating 5,000 voters of the State of Pennsylvania, urging the early enactment into law of the Howell-Barkley bill (S. 2646; H. R. 7358), to provide for the expeditious and prompt settlement, mediation, conciliation, and arbitration of disputes between carriers and their employees and subordinate officials; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

TUESDAY, April 22, 1924.

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1924.)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The principal clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Ernst	King	Shipstead
Bayard	Fernald	Lodge	Shortridge
Borah	Ferris	McDermick	Simmons
Brandegee	Fess	McKellar	Smoot
Broussard	Fletcher	McKinley	Spencer
Bursum	Frazier	McLean	Stanfield
Cameron	George	Mayfield	Stephens
Capper	Gerry	Moses	Swanson
Caraway	Glass	Neely	Trammell
Colt	Gooding	Norbeck	Underwood
Copeland	Hale	Oddie	Wadsworth
Cummins	Harris	Overman	Walsh, Mass.
Curtis	Harrison	Phillips	Walsh, Mont.
Dale	Heflin	Russell	Warren
Dial	Howell	Robinson	Watson
Dill	Johnson, Minn.	Sheppard	Weller
Edwards	Jones, N. Mex.	Stields	Wilks

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENBOUR] is absent on account of illness. I ask that the announcement may stand for the day.

I was requested to announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KAYES], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. RALSTON] are absent on business of the Senate.

I was also requested to announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent, attending a hearing before a special investigating committee of the Senate.

Mr. ROBINSON. I wish to announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHVEST] is absent on account of a death in his family. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-eight Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 52) for the relief of the drought-stricken farm areas of New Mexico, and that the House had receded from its amendment No. 4 to the said joint resolution.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate:

S. 431. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Cumberland River in Montgomery County, Tenn.;

S. 2108. An act to grant the consent of Congress to the Southern Railway Co. to maintain a bridge across the Tennessee River, at Knoxville, in the county of Knox, State of Tennessee;

S. 2112. An act authorizing the Department of Agriculture to issue semimonthly cotton-crop reports and providing for

their publication simultaneously with the ginning reports of the Department of Commerce;

S. 2736. An act authorizing use of Government buildings at Fort Crockett, Tex., for occupancy during State convention of Texas Shriners; and

S. 2821. An act to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act to incorporate the National McKinley Birthplace Memorial Association," approved March 4, 1911.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2798) to authorize the leasing for mining purposes of unallotted lands in the Kaw Reservation in the State of Oklahoma, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, severally with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 381. An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes," approved December 29, 1916 (39 Stat. L. p. 862);

S. 1609. An act to fix the time for the terms of the United States District Court in the Western District of Virginia;

S. 1704. An act for the relief of dispossessed allotted Indians of the Nisqually Reservation, Wash.;

S. 2902. An act authorizing the acquiring of Indian lands on the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, in Idaho, for reservoir purposes in connection with the Minidoka irrigation project;

S. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution authorizing the maintenance by the United States of membership in the International Statistical Bureau at The Hague;

S. J. Res. 77. Joint resolution authorizing the appointment of delegates to represent the United States at the seventh Pan American Sanitary Conference to be held at Habana, Cuba, in November, 1924; and

S. J. Res. 79. Joint resolution to provide for the representation of the United States at the meeting of the Inter-American Committee on Electrical Communications to be held in Mexico City beginning March 27, 1924.

The message further announced that the House had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 21. An act to amend the patent and trade-mark laws, and for other purposes;

H. R. 169. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to amend section 73 of an act entitled 'An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary,' approved June 12, 1916," and for other purposes;

H. R. 656. An act to add certain lands to the Plumas and to the Lassen National Forests in California;

H. R. 704. An act to authorize the Court of Appeals for the first circuit to hold sittings at San Juan, P. R.;

H. R. 731. An act authorizing the Wichita and affiliated bands of Indians in Oklahoma to submit claims to the Court of Claims;

H. R. 4168. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to punish the unlawful breaking of seals of railroad cars containing interstate or foreign shipments, the unlawful entering of such cars, the stealing of freight and express packages or baggage or articles in process of transportation in interstate shipment, and the felonious asportation of such freight or express packages or baggage or articles therefrom into another district of the United States, and the felonious possession or reception of the same," approved February 13, 1913 (37 Stat. L. p. 670);

H. R. 4437. An act to quiet title to land in the municipality of Flomaton, State of Alabama;

H. R. 4526. An act to incorporate the United States Blind Veterans of the World War;

H. R. 4816. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to permit the city of Vicksburg, Miss., to construct and maintain water mains on and under the National Cemetery Road at Vicksburg, Miss.;

H. R. 5218. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Pittsburgh Coal, Land & Railroad Co. to construct a bridge across the Tug Fork of Big Sandy River at or near Nolan, in Mingo County, W. Va., to the Kentucky side, in Pike County, Ky.;

H. R. 6207. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to transfer to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice all that portion of the Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation which lies in the State of Missouri, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6255. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the incorporated town of Ketchikan, Alaska, to issue its

bonds in any sum not to exceed \$100,000 for the purpose of constructing a schoolhouse in said town and equipping the same," approved February 7, 1920;

H. R. 6298. An act to authorize the leasing for oil and gas mining purposes of unallotted lands on Indian reservations affected by the proviso to section 3 of the act of February 28, 1891;

H. R. 6628. An act to change the name of Jewett Street west of Wisconsin Avenue to Cathedral Avenue;

H. R. 6646. An act providing for the holding of the United States district and circuit courts at Durant, Okla.;

H. R. 6950. An act to authorize the incorporated town of Cordova, Alaska, to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$100,000 for the purpose of constructing and equipping a public-school building in said town of Cordova, Alaska;

H. R. 7079. An act prohibiting the importation of crude opium for the purpose of manufacturing heroin;

H. R. 7109. An act to authorize acquisition of unreserved public lands in the Columbia or Moses Reservation, State of Washington, under acts of March 28, 1912, and March 3, 1877, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7239. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to pay certain funds to various Wisconsin Pottawatomi Indians;

H. R. 8070. An act authorizing preliminary examinations and surveys of sundry streams with a view to the control of their floods;

H. R. 8229. An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of St. Paul, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River;

H. R. 8262. An act to fix the compensation of officers and employees of the legislative branch of the Government;

H. R. 8304. An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of Chicago to construct a bridge across the Calumet River at or near One hundredth Street, in the city of Chicago, county of Cook, State of Illinois;

H. R. 8366. An act to add certain lands to the Santiam National Forest;

H. R. 8369. An act to extend the period in which relief may be granted accountable officers of the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 231. Joint resolution directing a census to be taken of bales of cotton now held at various places; and

H. J. Res. 237. Joint resolution directing the Secretary of the Interior to withhold his approval of the adjustment of the Northern Pacific land grants, and for other purposes.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. FESS presented a petition, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of Toledo and vicinity, in the State of Ohio, praying for the passage of the so-called Dill bill (S. 2600) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyrights," approved March 4, 1909, which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Akron (Ohio) Bar Association, favoring the enactment of legislation providing for a board of tax appeals, to be appointed by the President, and to be entirely separate from the Treasury Department, such board to entertain appeals taken by taxpayers from decisions of the Treasury Department with respect to all questions arising under the revenue laws passed and effective since 1915, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Lodge No. 4, of the Pennsylvania System Fraternity, of Crestline, Ohio, protesting against the passage of legislation restricting the management of railroad systems in the operation of their roads, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a resolution of the City Commission of Sandusky, Ohio, protesting against the passage of the so-called Hull bill, or any similar legislation, seeking to divert a considerable volume of water from Lake Michigan into the Chicago Drainage Canal, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of Dayton, Ohio, praying for the participation of the United States in the world court, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. McLEAN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Stratford, Conn., praying for the participation of the United States in the Permanent Court of International Justice, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented the petition of the Roger Sherman Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of New Milford, Conn., praying for the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 64, proposing to change the name of "Mount Rainier" to "Mount Tacoma," which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the memorial of the board of directors of the New Haven (Conn.) Chamber of Commerce, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Gooding bill (S. 187) to amend section 4 of the interstate commerce act, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from members of the St. John Evangelist Lutheran Church, of New Britain, Conn., praying for the passage of House Joint Resolution 180, for the relief of the distressed and starving women and children of Germany, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Fifth District Republican Club (Inc.), of Bridgeport, Conn., favoring the passage of legislation granting increased compensation to postal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of New Haven, Conn., praying for the passage of the pending adjusted compensation bill for World War veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petitions of Hartford Lodge, No. 723, Loyal Order of Moose, and the Liederkranz Singing Society, both of Hartford, Conn., praying for the passage of legislation legalizing the manufacture and sale of beverages with a 2.75 per cent alcoholic content, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the memorials of the Woman's Christian Temperance Unions of Canterbury and East Danbury, both in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the passage of legislation legalizing the manufacture and sale of liquors with a 2.75 per cent alcoholic content, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented papers in the nature of petitions of the Lions Club and the chamber of commerce, both of Greenwich, in the State of Connecticut, praying for the participation of the United States in the forthcoming international conference for the suppression of the narcotic traffic, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented the petition of the Greenwich (Conn.) Chamber of Commerce, praying for the passage of Senate bill 1005, to make valid and enforceable written provisions or agreements for arbitration of disputes arising out of contracts, maritime transactions, or commerce among the States or Territories or with foreign nations, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CAPPER presented the memorial of sundry members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Scott City, Kans., remonstrating against the passage of legislation increasing the alcoholic content allowable in beer to 2.75 per cent, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the memorial of sundry citizens of Oberlin, Kans., remonstrating against the passage of legislation legalizing the sale of beer and light wines with increased alcoholic content, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Oberlin, Kans., praying for the adoption of the so-called McCormick child-labor amendment to the Constitution, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WILLIS presented a resolution adopted by the council of the city of Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against the passage of the so-called Hull bill, or any other measure which would authorize the sanitary district of Chicago to increase the amount of water diverted by it from Lake Michigan and so result in the further lowering of the level of Lake Erie, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the council of the city of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring a Federal appropriation for dredging that portion of the Cleveland Harbor which lies within the Cuyahoga River, and its several branches and arms, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. NORBECK presented petitions, telegrams, and papers in the nature of petitions of the Farmers' Elevator Co., the Farmers' Security Bank, and the State Bank, of Seneca; of O. P. Huetson, secretary of Clay County Farm Bureau, of Vermillion; of the Fall River County Farm Bureau Board, of Hot Springs; of the Bowdle Community Club, of Bowdle; of the Clark County Farm Bureau, of Clark; of Samuel Fahlgren, chairman, Pleasant Township Community Club, of Beresford, Lincoln County; of Edward E. Peterson, secretary, Vienna Livestock Shipping Association, of Vienna; of J. M. Tucker, chairman, Coffee Flat Farm Bureau, of Edgemont; of a special committee of farmers of Butler Township, Sanborn County; of the Hamlin County Farm Bureau, of Hayti; of C. L. Chase, secretary of a committee representing nine townships in Clark County; of Wilson Local, No. 369, American Cooperative and Educational Union of America, of Platte; of Carl Froome and

50 other citizens of Corsica; of Frank Petrig, of Ardmore; of Henry Scharnhorst and 55 other citizens of Egan, Trent, and Flandreau; of Joe Swaneutt and 86 other citizens of Sioux Falls, Valley Springs, Harrisburg, Ellis, Hartford, Humboldt, Canistota, Lennox, and Oldham; of J. A. Rogness and 9 other citizens of Astoria; of R. K. Rasmussen and 51 other citizens of Astoria, Brandt, and Gary; of Selmer Kirkvold and 15 other citizens of Deuel County; of F. H. Pappen and 12 other citizens of Desmet, Bancroft, and Manchester; of L. S. Haugen, chairman, Federal Farm Loan Association, of Sisseton; of A. Kopperud, president of the South Dakota Bankers' Association, of Webster; of Harry J. Boyts, secretary, South Dakota Export Commission League, of Aberdeen; of D. J. Reints, director of the South Dakota Wheat Growers' Association, of Britton; of the Bankers' Association of Roberts County; of the Commercial Clubs of Redfield, Mitchell, Tyndall, Mobridge, Gregory, Lake Andes, Lemmon, Sisseton, and Groton; all in the State of South Dakota, praying for the passage of the so-called McNary-Haugen export corporation bill, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. FLETCHER presented resolutions of the Board of County Commissioners of Collier County, Fla., respecting a national park, which were referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolutions of Board of County Commissioners of Collier County, Fla., respecting a national park

Mr. Taylor offered the following resolution:

"Whereas Barron Collier purchased from the Southern States Land & Timber Co. a large acreage of lands in what is now Collier County, Fla., and in such purchase there was reserved by Southern States Land & Timber Co. approximately 150 acres of land located in township 54 south of range 27 east, and known as Royal Palm Hammock, to be later conveyed and used for public park purposes; and

"Whereas such lands are within the territory of Collier County, and Lee County has relinquished any claims or title to said lands, and through its board of county commissioners has passed a resolution urging the establishment of a national park, using the said Royal Palm Hammock as a nucleus; and

"Whereas Barron Collier has this day appeared before this board and has stated that he wishes to have a national park in Collier County, to be named and designated as Lincoln-Lee Memorial National Park, and to be supported and maintained by the Federal Government, and in order to accomplish such purpose is willing to give and deed to the Federal Government sufficient lands, from 500 to 1,000 acres, contiguous to the 150 acres known as Royal Palm Hammock, for the purpose of establishing a national park, and is willing to assume the responsibility of erecting a beautiful entrance to said park and suitable statues of Abraham Lincoln and Robert E. Lee, and desires the cooperation of this board in presenting the matter to the Congress of the United States and in the working out of the details incident thereto; and

"Whereas this board is in hearty accord with the suggestion made by Mr. Collier and believes that the establishment of a national park in Collier County will be of benefit to this county and to the State of Florida and to the Nation at large; and

"Whereas this board believes, there being only one national park east of the Mississippi River, known as Lafayette National Park, in the State of Maine, that there should be preserved a section of the territory of this county typical of its growth and of the Everglades areas and of this section for the benefit of the citizens of the United States at large; Now, in order to carry out such plans, be it

"Resolved by the Board of County Commissioners of Collier County, Fla., as follows:

"1. That the Southern States Land & Timber Co., a corporation, be, and it is hereby, required to deed and convey approximately 150 acres of land, known as Royal Palm Hammock, to Barron Collier, as trustee, for the purpose of establishing a national park in Collier County, Fla.

"2. Be it further resolved, That in order to bring the matter before the Congress of the United States, that a committee from Collier County comprised of Gen. W. B. Haldeman, of Naples, Fla., and Barron Collier, of Everglades and New York, be, and they are hereby, designated as such committee, with others to be named thereon;

"3. Be it further resolved, That we do hereby request our Senators and Representatives in Congress to use their best endeavors to have the Federal Government accept said 150 acres known as Royal Palm Hammock, and such additional acreage as shall be given by Barron Collier, and to there establish a national park, naming and designating the same as 'Lincoln-Lee Memorial National Park,' and to maintain the same thereafter;

"4. Be it further resolved, That we express our appreciation to Barron Collier for his generous offer to give such lands for a national park, which will be a great benefit to south Florida in particular and the State of Florida and the Nation at large;

"5. Be it further resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be given to Barron Collier, the Southern States Land & Timber Co., the Board of County Commissioners of Lee County, Fla., Hon. Thomas A. Edison, and Henry Ford, who have been designated as the committeemen from Lee County, and our respective Representatives in Congress."

Upon motion of Taylor, seconded by Barfield, called and carried, the foregoing resolution was unanimously adopted.

STATE OF FLORIDA, County of Collier:

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of Collier County, Fla., at their regular meeting held April 9, 1924, and duly recorded in the minutes of said date.

Witness my hand and official seal this 16th day of April, A. D. 1924.

[SEAL] W. B. LANIER, Clerk.
By E. W. RUSSELL, D. C.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. JONES of Washington, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8143) for the protection of the fisheries of Alaska, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 449) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6202) to amend sections 11 and 12 of the merchant marine act, 1920, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 450) thereon.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico, from the Committee on Finance, submitted the views of the minority on the bill (H. R. 6715) to reduce and equalize taxation, to provide revenue, and for other purposes, which were ordered to be printed as Report No. 398, Part 2.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SWANSON:

A bill (S. 3139) for the relief of Fannie M. Higgins; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 3140) for the relief of Rachel Parke; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 3141) granting a pension to Margaret Oram; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NORRIS (for Mr. LA FOLLETTE):

A bill (S. 3142) for the relief of Lieut. George H. Hauge, United States Army; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 3143) to authorize an appropriation of \$20,000 for the purchase of certain lands in Seattle, King County, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PEPPER:

A bill (S. 3144) for the relief of Delaware River Towing Line; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHORTRIDGE:

A bill (S. 3145) to authorize a hearing for certain former officers of the Army discharged therefrom without honor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURSUM:

A bill (S. 3146) to extend the benefits of the United States employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, to Elizabeth Wright Cox; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3147) granting a pension to Manuel Baca;

A bill (S. 3148) granting a pension to Jennie Cooney; and

A bill (S. 3149) granting a pension to Carlos Conklin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PEPPER:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 115) to provide for the free transmission through the mails of certain publications for the blind; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. LODGE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 7220, the Agricultural Department appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 37, after line 3, to insert the following:

"There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually the sum of \$3,000,000, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the land-purchase provisions of the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. L. p. 961), as amended."

INTERNATIONAL STATISTICAL BUREAU AT THE HAGUE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 76) authorizing the maintenance by the United States of membership in the International Statistical Bureau at The Hague, which were to strike out all after the resolving clause, and to insert:

That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any sums in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, sums not exceeding \$2,500 per annum to enable the United States to maintain membership in the International Statistical Bureau at The Hague, such sums to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State.

And to amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution authorizing appropriations for the maintenance by the United States of membership in the International Statistical Bureau at The Hague."

Mr. LODGE. Those are only verbal changes in the joint resolution passed by the Senate, and I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

SEVENTH PAN AMERICAN SANITARY CONFERENCE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 77) authorizing the appointment of delegates to represent the United States at the seventh Pan American Sanitary Conference to be held at Habana, Cuba, in November, 1924, which were to strike out all after the resolving clause and to insert:

That the President is hereby empowered to appoint not to exceed four persons, including not less than two officers of the United States Public Health Service, as delegates to represent the United States at the seventh Pan American Sanitary Conference to be held in the city of Habana, Cuba.

For the expenses of such delegates in attending the conference, including the assembly of necessary data, the employment of interpreters, and the preparation of a report, \$3,000, to be available during the fiscal year 1925, is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State.

And to amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation to provide for the representation of the United States at the seventh Pan American Sanitary Conference to be held at Habana, Cuba."

Mr. LODGE. I make a statement similar to the last, that the changes made by the House are only verbal; the substance is the same; and I move concurrence in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

INTER-AMERICAN COMMITTEE ON ELECTRICAL COMMUNICATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 79) to provide for the representation of the United States at the meeting of the Inter-American Committee on Electrical Communications to be held in Mexico City beginning March 27, 1924, which were on page 1, line 5, to strike out all after "\$33,000" down to and including "1924" in line 8, and to insert: "(to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State), to defray the cost of representation of the United States at the meeting of the Inter-American Committee on Electrical Communications to be held in Mexico City, Mexico, in 1924: *Provided, however,* That the principal delegates shall not exceed three in number and shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided further,* That no person engaged in any private business related to the subject matter of said meeting shall be appointed as delegate, technical expert, secretary, or assistant secretary."

And to amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to provide for the representation of the United States at the meeting of the Inter-American Committee on Electrical Communications to be held in Mexico City in 1924."

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

UNALLOTTED LANDS IN THE KAW RESERVATION, OKLA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2798) to authorize the leasing for mining purposes of un-

allotted lands in the Kaw Reservation in the State of Oklahoma, which was on page 1, line 11, after the word "prescribe," to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That the production of oil and gas and other minerals on such lands may be taxed by the State in which said lands are located in all respects the same as production on unrestricted lands, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to cause to be paid the tax so assessed against the royalty interests on said lands: *Provided, however,* That such tax shall not become a lien or charge of any kind or character against the land or the property of the Indian owner.

Mr. CURTIS. The amendment simply provides that the royalties derived from the leasing of the oil land shall be taxable to the State without a lien upon the land. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

* HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated below:

H. R. 21. An act to amend the patent and trade-mark laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

H. R. 4168. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to punish the unlawful breaking of seals of railroad cars containing interstate or foreign shipments, the unlawful entering of such cars, the stealing of freight and express packages or baggage or articles in process of transportation in interstate shipment, and the felonious asportation of such freight or express packages or baggage or articles therefrom into another district of the United States, and the felonious possession or reception of the same," approved February 13, 1913 (37 Stat. L. p. 670); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

H. R. 6628. An act to change the name of Jewett Street west of Wisconsin Avenue to Cathedral Avenue; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 7079. An act prohibiting the importation of crude opium for the purpose of manufacturing heroin; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 6255. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the incorporated town of Ketchikan, Alaska, to issue its bonds in any sum not to exceed \$100,000 for the purpose of constructing a schoolhouse in said town and equipping the same," approved February 7, 1920; and

H. R. 6950. An act to authorize the incorporated town of Cordova, Alaska, to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$100,000 for the purpose of constructing and equipping a public-school building in said town of Cordova, Alaska; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions.

H. R. 4816. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to permit the city of Vicksburg, Miss., to construct and maintain water mains on and under the National Cemetery Road at Vicksburg, Miss.; and

H. R. 6207. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to transfer to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice all that portion of the Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation which lies in the State of Missouri, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 731. An act authorizing the Wichita and affiliated bands of Indians in Oklahoma to submit claims to the Court of Claims;

H. R. 6298. An act to authorize the leasing for oil and gas mining purposes of unallotted lands on Indian reservations affected by the proviso to section 3 of the act of February 28, 1891; and

H. R. 7239. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to pay certain funds to various Wisconsin Pottawatomie Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 656. An act to add certain lands to the Plumas and to the Lassen National Forests in California;

H. R. 4437. An act to quiet title to land in the municipality of Flomaton, State of Alabama;

H. R. 8366. An act to add certain lands to the Santiam National Forest;

H. R. 7109. An act to authorize acquisition of unreserved public lands in the Columbia or Moses Reservation, State of Washington, under acts of March 28, 1912, and March 3, 1877, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 237. Joint resolution directing the Secretary of the Interior to withhold his approval of the adjustment of the Northern Pacific land grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

H. R. 169. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to amend section 73 of an act entitled 'An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary,' approved June 12, 1916," and for other purposes;

H. R. 704. An act to authorize the Court of Appeals for the first circuit to hold sittings at San Juan, P. R.;

H. R. 4526. An act to incorporate the United States Blind Veterans of the World War;

H. R. 6646. An act providing for the holding of the United States district and circuit courts at Durant, Okla.; and

H. R. 8369. An act to extend the period in which relief may be granted accountable officers of the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5218. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Pittsburgh Coal, Land & Railroad Co. to construct a bridge across the Tug Fork of Big Sandy River at or near Nolan, in Mingo County, W. Va., to the Kentucky side, in Pike County, Ky.;

H. R. 8070. An act authorizing preliminary examinations and surveys of sundry streams with a view to the control of their floods;

H. R. 8229. An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of St. Paul, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River;

H. R. 8304. An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of Chicago to construct a bridge across the Calumet River at or near One hundredth Street, in the city of Chicago, County of Cook, State of Illinois; and

H. J. Res. 231. Joint Resolution directing a census to be taken of bales of cotton now held at various places; to the Committee on Commerce.

H. R. 8262. An act to fix the compensation of officers and employees of the legislative branch of the Government; ordered to lie on the table.

MUSCLE SHOALS

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Washington Daily News of April 9, 1924, entitled, "Changing times; changing mind."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

CHANGING TIMES; CHANGING MIND

This paper has been rather in favor of accepting Henry Ford's offer for Muscle Shoals.

Changed conditions have changed that opinion.

To begin with, when the Ford offer was first made the Government was utterly in the power of a plunderbund in full control of Congress and of the administration.

Albert Fall personified the governing policy toward national natural resources.

The big idea was to give everything that could be given to private exploiters, with free and unlimited right to tax the public.

Muscle Shoals was to be given away to the Alabama Power Co. or to the budding and fast-developing Power Trust, which in 50 years or less would have had a tighter stranglehold on the public than the Coal Trust has had for the past 25 years.

As an alternative evil the Ford plan was the lesser.

But times have changed. The danger isn't past, and Secretary Work is a worthy successor to Fall as an anticonservationist, while Secretary Weeks, Fall's political and business partner, is still on the job with "more business in Government" as his watchword.

The public is slightly awakened, however, and reasserts with increasing emphasis its belief in the conservation policies of Roosevelt, Pinchot, and Wilson.

When the Ford plan passed the House, amendment after amendment was offered which would protect the public interest. Each was voted down on threat that "Ford would not stand for it."

The only thing that made the Ford plan pass the House was a feeling of confidence in Henry Ford's good faith. But Ford will not live more than 15 or 20 years, and his heirs and successors are to be given Muscle Shoals for 100 years.

From the beginning Senator Norris and those who believe with him have refused to be swept off their feet by the Ford illusion. Norris is prepared to make a fight in the Senate against the Ford offer and in favor of the Government keeping the great water power.

It is to be hoped and expected that Senator Norris will win his fight. It is to be hoped that true conservation applied to Muscle Shoals will end the orgy of loot of the water powers of the country.

As a unit in a nationally owned and operated superpower system, Muscle Shoals can be made to reduce the cost of living of our children and our grandchildren. At least one less monster trust will feed upon the body of the public.

How many of us would favor the gift of hundreds of millions of dollars to Ford if the bill frankly stated its intent and belief thus: "A bill to turn Muscle Shoals over to Henry Ford and his son Edsel

and his grandchildren and great-grandchildren for 100 years, this Nation being convinced that Henry Ford is an able, unselfish, and public-spirited citizen and that his methods and ideals are hereditary"?

Not many.

Thank Heaven, the Teapot has pointed the way to a return to the wiser, safer, and more patriotic ways of the conservationists. It may mean fewer multimillionaires, but it will also mean lower cost of living for everybody.

Read this in the light of your last winter's coal bill.

ADJUSTED COMPENSATION FOR WORLD WAR VETERANS

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7959) to provide adjusted compensation for veterans of the World War, and for other purposes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, if adjusted compensation for the American soldier in the World War had not been based on justice and on right it would long ago have lost its appeal for the American people. It has been subjected to the bitterest, most prolonged, and most powerful attack ever directed against a legislative measure. And yet it survives, a tribute to the unconquerable sense of right that still dwells in the hearts of the masses.

Observe, Mr. President, how the cause of our brave defenders has outlived tremendous obstacles and formidable delays. The pronounced discrepancy between the pay of the soldier and that of civilian labor during the war, the losses incurred by the surrender of positions when men were called to the colors and the difficulty of resecuring them or of obtaining others of equal value; the damage to life programs and careers due to the sudden separation from school and college, from business, and profession; the spectacle of readjustments by Congress of the compensation of contractors, railroads, manufacturers, shipbuilders, corporations, and so forth, growing out of war services and war conditions, all created a feeling among the soldiers, their families, friends, and undoubtedly a majority of the American people that the Government should take some step in the matter of readjusted compensation for ex-service men.

These men had cheerfully responded at a dollar a day, plus Army allowances of food and clothing, when those at home were receiving for ordinary labor from three to five times the equivalent of that pay and allowance, cheerfully responded to the summons which meant agony and death and deprivation in the cause of country and flag and God, perished by thousands in a distant land, were maimed and disabled by thousands, faced loss of employment and actual want by thousands on their return, offered their bodies that liberty might be preserved in the spirit illustrated by the divine martyrdom almost 2,000 years ago upon the crest of Golgotha.

In the Congress that had been elected during the war a bill providing various forms of adjusted compensation passed the House and came to the Senate before the adjournment of the second session of that Congress, the Sixty-sixth, in June, 1920. The bill produced the funds it proposed to distribute by additional surtaxes on incomes, a stock and bond tax, a produce exchange tax, a real-estate tax, additional taxes on tobacco and cigars, and a stock-dividend tax. The cash option carried in the bill meant the equivalent of \$1 a day for home service, \$1.25 a day for overseas service, excepting 60 days in each case which were held to have been covered by the payment of \$60 which each soldier had received on discharge. Other options included interest-bearing 20-year certificates, vocational training aid, aid in acquiring farm or home and land settlement aid.

The Senate took no action before adjournment and the matter was postponed until after the national election. The Republican Party was in control of both branches of Congress and could have passed the measure if it had so desired. The impression was carefully cultivated that the bill would pass the following winter. It seemed to have general support both in and out of Congress. A number of States had voted liberal recognition to their own troops. Petitions with millions of signatures flooded Congress. The third and last session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, Republican, I repeat, in both branches, expired, however, and with it expired the first adjusted compensation bill.

During the first session of the Sixty-seventh Congress, overwhelmingly Republican in both branches, with a Republican President in the White House, another adjusted compensation bill was introduced in the Senate and soon favorably reported. It was substantially similar to the bill which failed in the preceding Republican Congress but with the provisions for special taxes to raise the needed funds omitted. The Senate by an almost unanimous vote proceeded to its consideration. It seemed certain of adoption by that body unless some unexpected influence should intervene. That influence materialized in the

appearance in person of President Harding before the Senate, and in his address to the Senate in the course of which he urged the recommitment of the bill. His chief argument was that the bill was too severe a burden on the Treasury. He favored the principle of adjusted compensation. The bill was then recommitment by the Republican Senate and went back to the Finance Committee to enter the eternal sleep. But the matter would not down.

The bonus Banquo began to haunt the murderous Republican Macheth at every turn. The sense of injustice deepened among the soldiers and the people in general. Appeals to Congress multiplied. The commercial and financial interests of the country became so alarmed by the vitality of a measure they could not secretly kill that in desperation they ceased to fight under cover, dropped the weapons of subtle and clandestine manipulation, and began a course of active, open, and violent opposition. The President notified the Republican leaders in Congress that he would veto any further bill that did not provide a special tax, suggesting a sales tax as a proper and practicable means of producing the necessary funds. In the face of this notice Republican House leaders prepared and reported in March of 1922—that is, during the second session of the Sixty-seventh Congress—a third adjusted compensation measure without special tax provisions. It followed the same general lines of the former bills, except that the cash option was almost entirely eliminated and the cost to the Government spread over a period of 40 years. It passed the House and Senate by large majorities. True to his word, and as the Republican majority in Congress knew he would do, the Republican President vetoed the bill. The House turned down the veto by much more than the required two-thirds, but in the Republican Senate sufficient votes were found to prevent the overturn of the veto there. Thus wealth again scored against humanity.

I shall not pause to review at length the arguments that have been advanced in Congress to show that this country is entirely able to accord just treatment to its saviors. It is only necessary to point out that the total national indebtedness, twenty-one and a half billions, in round numbers, is less than 7 per cent of our estimated national wealth of \$320,000,000,000; that the total cost of the last adjusted compensation measure, taking the Treasury's figures of \$1,000,000,000, would not add 2 per cent to that proportion. With the cost of adjusted compensation added to our existing national debt, the total would be far less, in proportion to our national wealth, than the debt of any of the principal nations participating in the World War, with the sole exception of Japan.

I wish to refer a moment to the suggestion that adjusted compensation is an attempt to commercialize patriotism. If that be true, it was an attempt to commercialize patriotism to fix any compensation for the soldier at all. When Congress increased the pay of the private soldier from the pre-war figure of \$15 per month to \$30, it figured that with subsistence and clothing added the soldier would receive the equivalent of about \$3 per day, thinking that this represented the average remuneration of ordinary labor. Inflation of living costs and wages, however, set in to such an extent that civilian labor rose to \$5, \$8, \$10 a day, and in certain instances even higher. Nobody claimed that it was an insult to the soldier to fix his compensation in the first instance at some figure and on some basis at once reasonable and fair.

And no one may fairly claim now that an endeavor to redress whatever injustice was involved in that first adjustment is a reflection on his integrity or love of country.

The Republican President who succeeded President Harding declared against adjusted compensation in his initial message to the Congress. The Republican Party can not escape responsibility for the failure to provide adjusted compensation for our veterans of the World War, the preservers of our civilization. The Republican Party failed to pass an adjusted compensation measure which provided special taxes for the needed funds. At the command of a Republican President it recommitment an adjusted compensation measure with the special taxes eliminated, and then, in the face of his statement that he would veto any further proposal with the taxes omitted, it sent to him such a bill, literally challenging his veto and conspiring with him for its destruction. Now, in a desperate effort to present a bill to the new Republican President in such form as to be but little more than an apology and a shadow, in the form of an insurance measure which can hardly be called a genuine compensation bill, prompted either by the hope that in such form it may cause him to repudiate the position he has already taken, or by the knowledge that he will kill it anyhow, the Republican Party adds another chapter to the perfidious drama it has enacted in connection with this subject. The

whole procedure bears the earmarks of an unholy Republican game, a game to deceive the former soldiers on the one hand, and to keep the favor of the great financial interests on the other.

Mr. President, I shall support this measure when offered for final passage if efforts to amend it fail, but I shall support it under protest, and only because at this time it embodies the only prospect of action of any kind.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President, the pending bill which has been reported out by the Finance Committee is probably not in accord in its details with the judgment of many Members of the Senate. I should have liked to have had a little different arrangement. I introduced a bill which represented conception of the obligations of the Government to the veterans of the World War. I believed it would have been a more satisfactory bill, and I am still inclined to that opinion. It provided for a cash option distributed over four years, so that the financing of the bill would not have disturbed the industrial conditions of the country. However, to my mind any Member of Congress who is the real friend of the veterans and desires legislation on the subject will vote for the bill as reported by the Finance Committee.

The bill as now presented to the Senate is far superior to the bill which was presented at the last Congress. Many of the very objectionable and expensive features of the former bill have been eliminated. When I say "expensive features" I refer to the loan provisions of the bill which was submitted at the last Congress, which would have entailed a very heavy rate of interest to the borrower, which, in turn, would have been suffered by the veterans. Those features have been eliminated in the pending bill, which makes a more businesslike measure.

Again, there is this to be said: I see no reason why a Member of the Senate or of the House should set himself up as a spokesman for the veterans of this country as against the judgment of the organizations which have a right to represent the veterans. The American Legion, which has posts and organizations in nearly every hamlet of the country, almost unanimously indorsed the provisions of the bill as reported by the Finance Committee. I have received similar communications from the several posts in my State on behalf of the veterans. These organizations approve the bill as brought out by the Finance Committee.

The present bill features the insurance plan.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. BURSUM. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. The statement just made by the Senator is quite an interesting one. I have not understood the representatives of the Legion as going quite so far as the Senator's observations would indicate. He thinks they have gone in support of the bill reported by the Finance Committee. I have not understood the representatives of the organization as stating that this bill was satisfactory to the Legion or that it was what the ex-service men desired. I have understood them as taking the position that the ex-service men were willing to accept it because it was all they thought they could get at this time, and not that they thought it was what they are entitled to. Am I mistaken as to that?

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President, I will say to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina that his conception about the wishes of the ex-service men is to some extent probably true. So far as the organization is concerned, and posts which belong to the American Legion, I have received absolute and definite requests by telegram and by letter asking my support for the bill, and referring to it by number, so that there is no question in my mind but that the American Legion and the posts in that whole organization, which is the most potential in this country representing the ex-service men, have indicated their approval of the bill and a desire for its passage.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me further, I have received a great many telegrams myself, chiefly from representatives of the Legion, asking my support of this measure; but the communications I have received have seemed to me to stress the idea that the senders were for this measure because they were led to believe that they could not obtain through the party now in power anything that was more satisfactory. It has seemed to me that they have tried, in their telegrams and in their representations, to make it clear that this bill did not give them what they wanted, that it was in the nature of a makeshift, and that they were accepting it because they did not expect at this time to be able to get any more.

I have been impressed with that running all through the telegrams that have been read here, and I have been impressed with it running through all the telegrams that I have received. Now, Mr. President, I want to say—and I am not saying it in any controversial spirit—that I think there is a reason why these representatives of the Legion have indicated to Senators that they want them to support this measure because it is the best that they think they can get at this time, and that reason is this: They know, as I think they must know, that the vast majority of service men in this country will not be satisfied with this measure. They will either feel that they are taking something less than they are entitled to, something less than they want, or they will feel that hereafter the doors will be thrown more widely open to them, and they can come back to Congress and get the full measure of relief to which they think they are entitled.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President, my experience does not coincide with the statement of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina. I do believe that there are many ex-service men who would prefer a different kind of a bill, and will not be entirely satisfied with this one. That is perfectly true. So far as the organized ex-service men of this country are concerned, however, there is no question in my mind that this bill meets their approval. The best evidence is their own statements.

I desire to call the attention of the Senator from North Carolina to a portion of a telegram dated Indianapolis, April 19, directed to Hon. D. U. FLETCHER, Washington, D. C., from John R. Quinn, National Commander of the American Legion. A portion of this telegram is as follows:

The bill overwhelmingly passed by House and as reported by Senate Finance Committee is in accordance with resolutions adopted at last two national conventions of the American Legion. It meets approval of members of Legion. Question of immediate cash has not been before ex-service men and women for two years. My dear Senator, in name of ex-service men and women of our country, we ask your support of bill as reported by Senate Finance Committee without amendment. Your active support will receive sincere appreciation of ex-service men and women of our country.

That is the explicit, specific, perfectly plain statement of the commander of the Legion, who represents the ex-service men belonging to that organization all over this country.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURSUM. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. What is the date of the telegram that the Senator read?

Mr. BURSUM. April 19.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator will be interested in a telegram which is dated April 21, from the head of the soldiers in Arkansas, addressed to me at the Senate Office Building:

Notice by press dispatch you have introduced soldiers' bonus bill with cash item. More power to you. Sentiment in Arkansas overwhelmingly in favor of cash option.

Mr. BURSUM. By whom is that signed?

Mr. COPELAND. It is signed by John H. Stewart.

Mr. BURSUM. Representing whom?

Mr. COPELAND. The head of the soldiers in that State.

Mr. BURSUM. The commander? Is he the commander of the Legion?

Mr. COPELAND. I do not know what his office is, but the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY] will be glad to tell the Senator who this man is.

Mr. BURSUM. Did he sign the telegram as commander?

Mr. COPELAND. He did not.

Mr. BURSUM. Or as an official of any post?

Mr. COPELAND. He did not; but he said that the sentiment in Arkansas was overwhelmingly in favor of this cash bonus.

Mr. BURSUM. No doubt that boy stated his desires within his conception, but I dare say that a great many posts in the State of Arkansas have officially indorsed this bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I have no doubt about that. It was explained to them, no doubt, that this was all they could get at this time, and they officially indorsed it.

I have had some experience with reference to this matter. The commander of a certain Southern State called on me only a few days ago and exhibited to me a telegram from Mr. Quinn, directed to him, which urged him as the commander to approve this bill, and to try the best he could to induce his Senators to support it. In that telegram his argument was that this was the best measure that could be had at this time, and that if an attempt should be made to obtain anything else it would undoubtedly meet with a veto from the White House, and that there were not sufficient votes available to override that veto.

Instead of answering Mr. Quinn, the commander of the Legion in the State to which I refer came to see me to talk with me about it. It was his idea, not that this measure was what was demanded by the service men, but that the service men had been led to believe that it was all they could get and that any effort to enlarge its benefits to the soldiers would meet with a veto, and that an enlarged bill could not command enough votes in the Senate to override the veto but that this bill would probably command sufficient votes to override the veto.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President, I do not feel that we ought to be concerned as to whether or not the bill will be vetoed. The right to object to legislation is a constitutional right of the President. The right to enact legislation is constitutional on the part of the Congress. The Congress should exercise its judgment, the Executive should exercise his, independent of any influence from the other branch of the Government.

So far as the chances of passing a cash option at this time are concerned, I call the attention of the Senator from North Carolina to the fact that the House threshed out that question pretty well. Both sides of that question were presented to the House committee. The question was argued there. It was finally won out upon the lines of this bill by a majority vote of the committee. Taking that as a basis, I say we may well conclude that the chances of changing this bill at this late date are slight, and such a course would be hazardous. It might result in the loss of the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURSUM. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator says that he thinks this body ought to do its conscientious duty and the President of course ought to be left to do his?

Mr. BURSUM. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. In that I think the Senator is correct. I want to ask him, though, is he conscientiously in favor of a cash bonus?

Mr. BURSUM. I will say to the Senator that I am conscientiously in favor of solving this problem. I am conscientiously in favor of passing this bill and disposing of it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is the Senator in favor of a cash bonus?

Mr. BURSUM. If I believed that it would come to something, that it would become a law, that it would not be the means of defeating this legislation, that it would not be the means of keeping this question open forever and forever, I would vote for it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then, as I understand the Senator, he really believes in a cash bonus, but he is going to yield to what he considers the political exigencies of the occasion and vote against the cash bonus at this time? Is that correct?

Mr. BURSUM. Not at all; far from it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Well, I want to ask the Senator—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield further to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BURSUM. I do.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to ask the Senator if he did not vote for a cash bonus in September, 1922?

Mr. BURSUM. I did, and I proposed it, and it was voted down. It was voted down in this Chamber, and I apprehend that there is no more chance now than there was then of passing it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Why, there was a cash-bonus provision in the bill of 1920.

Mr. BURSUM. Never.

Mr. McKELLAR. And then, in addition to that, the Senator also voted to pass it over President Harding's veto, did he not?

Mr. BURSUM. I did.

Mr. McKELLAR. And now the Senator is repudiating both of those votes?

Mr. BURSUM. No, sir; far from it. This is a far better bill than the bill to which the Senator from Tennessee refers. The bill which was passed at that time, and which President Harding vetoed, contained no cash provision except the \$50 provision which we have here. It had a very objectionable, expensive loan provision, which is greatly improved by the provisions of this bill. This is a better bill than the bill which President Harding vetoed.

Mr. McKELLAR. And yet the Senator would not be willing this time to pass a bill with a cash option in it over the President's veto—

Mr. BURSUM. Oh, I have not said that.

Mr. McKELLAR. Although in 1922 the Senator did vote to pass such a bill over the President's veto?

Mr. BURSUM. No; it was not contained in the bill of 1922.

Mr. McKELLAR. That was the five-option plan.

Mr. BURSUM. Not at all. There was no cash provision in that bill other than the \$50 provision. The bill which was vetoed by President Harding contained a loan provision which was far inferior to the loan provision of this bill and more expensive.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was a provision, however, under which the soldiers could get the cash. This is a bill under which the soldiers can not get the cash, but they will have to wait three years before they can borrow even \$87 on the certificate, and in addition to that they will have to die before they can get anything if they do not want to borrow on it.

Mr. BURSUM. Oh, no; that is not quite the fact. The soldier might have obtained cash under the bill which was vetoed by President Harding by borrowing and paying a high rate of interest.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BURSUM. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to ask the Senator why this change of front on his part?

Mr. BURSUM. There is no change of front.

Mr. McKELLAR. Having advocated, to the extent of overriding the veto of the President belonging to his own party in 1922, a bill with five different alternative plans, all compensating the soldier, now the Senator is unwilling to vote for more than one of the five plans that he voted for then. How does the Senator explain that remarkable change of position?

Mr. BURSUM. Let me say to the Senator from Tennessee that I will vote for any bill having a chance to pass, whether it provides for all cash, a cash option, or any other kind of a reasonable bill, and will vote to override the President's veto should one be interposed.

Mr. McKELLAR. If that is so, why is the Senator—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee has not addressed the Chair.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from New Mexico has yielded.

Mr. BURSUM. The trouble is not with the President; the trouble is with Congress. You can not pass that kind of a bill. That is your trouble.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator has yielded to me—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. And the colloquy is going on. I hope the Chair will permit the Senator to yield to me if he is willing to do so. Of course, if the Chair objects, I shall not press the matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BURSUM. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator says the trouble is with Congress. Of course, when the former friends of the bonus, such as the Senator from New Mexico was, now take the position that it must be an insurance policy or nothing for the soldier—

Mr. BURSUM. Not at all. If the Senate passed a bill carrying the cash option and it went to the House, and the House passed it, I would vote for it over the President's veto; but I say—

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to know that the Senator will do that.

Mr. BURSUM. I say the Senator from Tennessee is entirely wrong in his premise. The trouble is not with the President; the trouble is in passing the bill through Congress. That has already been thrashed out.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BURSUM. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I was very much interested in what the Senator said about voting for this bill because it is the only way to help the soldier. I am going to vote for the cash bonus, with the idea that if that is voted down, or if the President vetoes it, we will then offer the insurance plan on the tax bill which has been reported to the Senate, and I want to know why the Senator is not willing to support that action.

Mr. BURSUM. The Senator from New Mexico is not in favor of entering into any kind of a procedure which would be calculated to defeat the object and purpose of the legislation which is pending. Furthermore, the Senator from New Mexico is not willing to place his judgment above the judgment of those who are legally constituted to represent and who have a right to speak for the veterans, and a much better right than any Member of this body.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield—

Mr. BURSUM. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to ask him this question: I was greatly interested in the Senator's statement just a moment ago that even though a cash provision were inserted in the bill, the Senator would still vote for the bill and would vote to override the President's veto of the bill if it were interposed.

Mr. BURSUM. Absolutely.

Mr. McKELLAR. In other words, the Senator does not take the position which is taken by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS], that they would not vote to override the President's veto in the event one were interposed to a cash bonus. To that extent I congratulate the Senator. I think the Senator should not make a stand against a provision in the bill which he says he is perfectly willing to support, even to the extent of voting to override the President's veto if one should be interposed.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President, my concern is not about what the Chief Executive will do. That is his business. My concern is about what Congress will do. We know what the House has done, and we have no reason to believe that the House will reverse itself. After all, the regularly constituted organizations representing the veterans, who have a right to speak for the veterans of this country, have said that they are satisfied with the bill, and give it their approval, and have asked us to pass the bill. I submit that it would be highly improper on our part to substitute ourselves as superior authorities as to what is best for what is desired by the veterans of this country.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. BURSUM. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. Does the Senator believe that the individual Members of the House had a fair chance to express their views on the bonus? Was it not presented to the House in such a way, under their rules, that a Member had to choose whether he would vote for the particular measure which was presented or vote against the bonus? Did the individual Member have a fair chance to express himself?

Mr. BURSUM. It is not up to the Senator from New York, or within his power or within my power, to reconstruct the House. The same rules which were in effect a month ago, when this bill was passed, are still in effect. The same House is sitting. There is no reason to expect that any different handling of this bill will be had if the matter is sent back to the House.

Mr. COPELAND. But the Senator made the point against the cash option here that the House had taken certain action. If the Senate were to adopt the pending amendment, it would give the House a chance to vote on the cash option. That measure would go to the House and they would have a chance to express their views on a cash bonus, which they have not had up to this time.

Mr. BURSUM. The House had that chance, and had ample opportunity. It was presented very ably by the champions of that feature of the question.

Mr. President, something has been said about the political phase of this question, and an effort has been made to place responsibility on the Republican Party for the failure of the passage of the bonus. This is not a partisan question. Politics can not legitimately enter into the proposition of whether or not veterans of the country shall be paid that which those of us who favor the proposal believe is honestly and legitimately due them. That can not be a partisan question. Men of both parties have differed, and will differ.

It is not a partisan question, and I say God pity the man who votes for an amendment because he may be championing the cause of the veterans and thinks that by so doing he will initiate or will earn any political claim on the veterans on that account. If we pass this bill, we will pass it because we believe it just, because we believe it an obligation, and we will not pass it for political gain.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BURSUM. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator speaks of making this a political question. On our side there has been no caucus; nothing has been done to try to line up the Democrats for any one bill.

Mr. BURSUM. Permit me to call the attention of the Senator from Georgia to the fact that mention of the responsibility being placed upon the Republicans as a party has been made here on the floor no less than two or three times this morning.

Mr. HARRIS. But I believe the Senator's party caucused on this question, while the Democrats did not.

Mr. BURSUM. May I advise the Senator from Georgia that not once has this question ever been brought up in caucus by the Republicans.

Mr. HARRIS. I am very glad to hear that. It never has been, on this side.

Mr. BURSUM. Every Member on this side of the Chamber I am sure is perfectly free to vote his convictions.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. BURSUM. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. In his statements in the colloquy between himself and the Senator from Tennessee the Senator from New Mexico made it perfectly clear to me that he himself is not satisfied with this Senate committee bill; that he has heretofore voted for a cash proposition, and that he is still in favor of a cash proposition; but that he is accepting this, just as I said the Legion people are accepting it, because he can not get what he wants, what he would prefer, and what he thinks would be a full measure of justice to the service men.

Mr. BURSUM. I am perfectly free to say to the Senator that if I had been preparing a bill, and it were within my power to say the kind of a bill which should be passed, it probably would not agree with the bill which is before us.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is what I understood the Senator's position to be, and that is what I say is the position of the service men throughout the country. That is the ground upon which they are urging us to pass this bill. The Senator says that he not only voted for a cash payment, but that he offered an amendment, as I understand—

Mr. BURSUM. No; it was a bill. The bill is before the Finance Committee, of which the Senator from North Carolina is a member, and has never been reported.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator says he introduced that bill, but that it did not pass, because the Senate was opposed, as I understand him to say, to the cash proposition. Now the Senator says he is still in favor of payment in cash and would still vote for a proposition of that kind. He says that the trouble is not at the White House, but that the trouble is in Congress. That is, the Senator means to say, as I understand him, that the Congress would not vote for a cash proposition, and he bases that opinion upon the fact that some time ago they voted down his proposition. I want to say to the Senator that I am absolutely satisfied that if the Senate could get a bona fide vote upon the question of a cash option, disconnected from the apprehension that the President would veto it, there would not be the slightest trouble in the world about getting not only a majority in the Senate in favor of a cash proposition, but a very large majority in favor of it.

Then the Senator says he is afraid of the House upon this question. The House has passed this insurance bill, but, as the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] has stated, the House had no opportunity, as I understand it, to vote upon the alternative proposition or to vote upon a combination of the two methods of payment. They were precluded, by their peculiar rules, as I understand it, from a vote of that sort.

In confirmation, however, of the impression which I have, amounting to a conviction, that the House would now vote to attach a cash-option proposition to this bill, it has been stated upon the floor of the Senate, if my recollection is not at fault—I think it was stated by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] yesterday—that if the Senate would add this cash-option proposition, and it should go over to the House, there would not be any conference, because the House is so strongly in favor of that proposition that they would accept the amendment of the Senate without sending it to conference.

I believe from what I have heard that that is about the situation with reference to the attitude of the House toward the question at this time.

Mr. BURSUM. I suggest that what the House will do is purely speculative on the part of the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. But the Senator must remember that he said the trouble was in the two Houses and not at the White House.

Mr. BURSUM. It is, and I am justified in saying so, because we have before us the evidence of their works. We have before us the bill which they passed.

Mr. SIMMONS. Let me ask the Senator if he believes, if a cash proposition were presented to the Senate as an alternative proposition or as an optional proposition, that the Senate would adopt it?

Mr. BURSUM. I believe absolutely, and I am satisfied, that if any great change is made in the bill it will be the means of delaying the passage of the bill at this session.

Mr. SIMMONS. But the Senator means at the White House, does he not?

Mr. BURSUM. No; I mean in Congress. Let me say to the Senator from North Carolina that there is no enemy of the liquidation of obligations so forceful as time, delay, time, delay. Time is of the essence of this whole proposition. If we fail to pass the bill at this session, in my judgment we will never pass such a bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. May I interrupt the Senator again?

Mr. BURSUM. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think the Senator has the thing absolutely reversed. Time is of the essence to a certain extent, but time will not operate against the ex-service men in this matter. The ex-service men could probably not have secured the legislation they wanted; the service men probably could not have secured even the minimum of legislation that is offered to them in this bill much earlier than the present time. Every day adds to the strength of the demand of the Legion forces in the country to the support of the bonus proposition.

If we pass the measure to-day, and it is felt to be inadequate by the service men and by their friends in the country, I venture the statement that the sentiment for additional legislation, in order that the soldier may receive full justice, will result in the speedy return of the representatives of that organization to Congress for additional legislation.

If we defeat their demands to-day, when they come next time they will come nearer to getting what they are entitled to than they are going to get to-day. My own judgment, from a careful study of the sentiment in my own State and other sections in the country with reference to the demands of the Legion and the ex-service men, is that the strength of their cause, the justice of their cause, the righteousness of their demands are growing stronger and stronger; that every day and every year in the hearts and the minds of the American people the sentiment is getting stronger and stronger, and we can not by any makeshift legislation put it down. We can now give them a modicum. We can now give them what is a mere sop, but in the end, I do not care how long the representatives of certain interests in the country may prevent it, the overwhelming sense of justice in this country toward these men will finally assert itself and they are going to get what they want.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair, for its own guidance, inquires of the Senator from New Mexico whether he has yielded the floor to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator from New Mexico did yield to me, and I do not think the Chair ought to object to it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair must know who has the floor.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. BURSUM. I yield.

Mr. McCORMICK. I ask permission of the Senator from New Mexico to offer three telegrams which seem to me somewhat pertinent to the remarks of the Senator from North Carolina, and I ask that they be incorporated in the Record at the end of the speech of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BURSUM. I ask that the telegrams be read now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, they will be read.

Mr. HEFLIN. I did not know they were to be read; I thought they were to be printed in the Record.

Mr. BRUCE. The Senator from New Mexico asked that they be read.

Mr. BURSUM. Let them be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The telegrams will be read as requested.

The reading clerk read as follows:

BLOOMINGTON, ILL., April 19, 1924.

Senator MEDILL McCORMICK,

Washington, D. C.:

Illinois legionnaires request you oppose any amendments to compensation bill and support bill as passed by House.

J. J. BULLINGTON,

Commander American Legion, Department of Illinois.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I object to any more of these telegrams being read or printed in the Record. Every one of us has received similar telegrams from

commanding officers of the Legion and it is simply delaying the progress of the bill.

Mr. BURSUM. I think the Senator ought not to object. I asked that the telegram be read for the information of the Senate. It is a matter which appertains to the debate, and if there is any objection to having them read at the desk I shall read them myself.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Every Senator has received dozens of such telegrams. The RECORD is to-day filled with pages of telegrams of a similar character.

Mr. BURSUM. Let the RECORD be filled. The RECORD is also filled with arguments against the very proposition which these telegrams support.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts object to the reading of the telegrams?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I do, because they are similar to other telegrams now in the RECORD. Every Senator has had communications of a similar kind.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico will proceed.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President, the important telegram here has already been read. It is from the Illinois legionnaires who request that any amendment to the compensation bill as passed by the House be opposed. It is signed by the commander of the American Legion, Department of Illinois. Another telegram is one from Commander Quinn, which has already been read and appears in the RECORD.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator? I know the Senator from Illinois thought the telegrams would disconcert me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. BURSUM. I can not yield at this time.

Mr. SIMMONS. The only reason why I ask the Senator to yield is that the Senator from Illinois, when he presented the telegrams, said he wanted my attention called to them.

Mr. BURSUM. I will yield in a moment. I want to be courteous to the Senator.

Mr. SIMMONS. My question has reference to the telegrams that the Senator is reading.

Mr. BURSUM. I have here another telegram, just handed to me by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE]. It is from New Haven, Conn., addressed to the Senator from Connecticut, and reads as follows:

Please oppose any amendments from floor of Senate, and in particular cash option, and support adjusted compensation bill as reported by Senate Finance Committee.

E. P. ARMSTRONG,

Department Commander American Legion of Connecticut.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield now?

Mr. BURSUM. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. I suppose that bushels of these telegrams have been received by Senators. It will be noted, however, that all of the telegrams which the Senator has just read couple their statement with the request that the Senator to whom they are directed shall vote against any amendment to the bill. Now, why should they put their request in that form?

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President—

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator who asked that the telegrams be read urged that my attention be called to them.

Mr. BURSUM. I submit that the Senator has a perfect right to take the floor in his own time.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator does not want to yield to me, of course I would not insist upon the courtesy.

Mr. BURSUM. I am willing to yield to any reasonable extent, but not for a speech.

So far as the question of righteousness and justice to the veterans and ex-service men who served this country so nobly and well in time of need, I yield to no one in my admiration, my allegiance, and my sympathy. But I submit that the bill which is pending is a better bill than the one for which the Senator from North Carolina and most of the Senators in this Chamber voted and which was vetoed by President Harding. It is a better bill in every way. True, the insurance is a feature of the bill, but after all it is a good feature. The man who takes care of his family and provides for them is a pretty good citizen. The man who takes out an insurance policy is taking an effective measure to provide for his family in case of need, in case of accident, in case of something happening to take him away as the support of that family.

I would not personally say to these boys, "We are going to give you insurance, because it is not safe to trust you with money." I do not believe in that doctrine, but I do say that the representatives of the ex-service men have a right to speak

and to say what they desire, and to give their approval. They have given their approval of the pending bill, and we have a right to respect their judgment, and not to set up our own personal judgment upon policies which will better please or satisfy the veterans as against the judgment of the organizations which represent the ex-service men of the country.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. BURSUM. I yield.

Mr. KING. I was attracted by the last sentence of the Senator to the effect that it is our duty to have no judgment of our own. That was the substance of it.

Mr. BURSUM. Oh, no. The Senator carries that a little too far.

Mr. KING. Was not that the inference of the Senator, that we must have no judgment of our own?

Mr. BURSUM. Oh, no.

Mr. KING. That we must abdicate and do whatever the Legion tells us to do?

Mr. BURSUM. Not at all; not at all. Nothing that I said could justify that kind of a construction.

Mr. KING. The Senator will not object if later I obtain from the reporter a transcript of his remark and read it into the RECORD?

Mr. BURSUM. What I said was that we had no right to set ourselves up as authority as to the kind of policy which would most benefit the ex-service men.

Mr. KING. Then the Senator thinks that we ought not to have any judgment of our own as to whether the policy is beneficial or otherwise?

Mr. BURSUM. Oh, yes; we might object to the whole proposition; but as for the right of the ex-service men to indicate the kind of policy which would be of greater benefit to them, I say they have the absolute right to do that.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. BURSUM. I yield.

Mr. KING. If the Senator's position is the correct position for legislators, it seems to me there is no necessity of having a Senate and a House of Representatives; but we should let the various groups and blocs and organizations of the United States determine what they want and then let them send their particular representatives here and pass the bill which they desire. Why have Senators and Representatives? Why not change our form of government?

Mr. BURSUM. The Senator from Utah has drifted away from a legitimate construction of what I said. I am perfectly willing to let my language stand as recorded, and the Senator may place such interpretation upon it as will gratify him.

Mr. KING. I shall have no gratification whatever in placing an interpretation upon the Senator's remarks; but let me say to the Senator that I shall be very much delighted if the Senator will assume the position which I am sure his conscience dictates that he shall assume, and will legislate here as his conscience and his judgment dictate upon all questions rather than upon the demands of any organization or any faction or any section or any class.

Mr. BURSUM. I will state to the Senator from Utah that my conscience is not troubling me any just now.

Mr. KING. No; I am afraid it does not. I wish it would trouble the Senator a little more.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President, I look upon what is generally termed a bonus, or referred to as such, as an obligation. I do not look upon the proposed benefit as a mere bestowal or a gift to the soldiers. I should not favor a gift or a mere bestowal. I do not believe that the ex-service men of this country have come to Congress to ask or to plead for alms or charity. They have come pursuant to a legitimate demand for the settlement of an obligation which is justly and morally due them. They have come for a refunding and a settlement of that of which we wrongfully deprived them while they were in the service.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BURSUM. I shall yield in just a moment. For instance, during the World War we initiated the program of giving a bonus of \$20 a month to every Government employee who received a salary of less than \$2,500 a year. The soldiers earned less than \$2,500 a year, and why were they made an exception to that rule? There can be no valid, legitimate reason for excepting the soldiers.

Further, we deducted from the soldier's wage the insurance premium while he was in the war. That was simply an out-

rageous exaction, which was not justified under any reason or precedent. In nearly every State in the Union whenever employment is had in hazardous occupations the laws of the several States impose upon the industry the payment of the insurance premium to cover that hazard. Can there be anything more hazardous than war? By what principle of right or ethics or decency did we deduct from the soldier's wage the premium of insurance in order to carry the insurance while he was engaged in service in the war? That premium amounted to six or eight dollars a month. Now, I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the bill for which the Senator from New Mexico previously voted carried a loan provision by which the soldier at any time within three years could borrow 50 per cent of the amount of insurance; in other words, if a \$500 policy was carried, the soldier could borrow on that policy \$250; and subsequently he could borrow 85 per cent, which would have been \$425. Those provisions, however, were not satisfactory to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BURSUM. They were not.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from New Mexico took the position that the soldier should have more cash. The Senator is now arguing against the cash provision. I now call his attention to the statement which he made on August 30, 1922.

Mr. BURSUM. I did take that position.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator offered a substitute for the bill which was then pending, and this is what he said in support of the substitute which he then offered:

The substitute provides for the payment within a year, or as soon as may be practicable after the passage of the proposed act, of 50 per cent of the allowance for the service of the ex-service man and of the other 50 per cent within five years thereafter. The deferred payment carries with it interest at the rate of 3½ per cent.

Thereupon the Senator made an argument at that time in favor of the cash provision for the soldiers of the war, but to-day the Senator is making an argument against any cash provision for the soldiers of the country. How does the Senator explain it?

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President, that is very easily explainable. I made that argument, and I was gloriously defeated on the floor of the Senate. There is no better chance, to my mind, to obtain a change, so far as improving the principles of the bill to-day are concerned, than there then was. Inasmuch as I feel very keenly that no remedy has been had up to this date, and, furthermore, that the proposal which is submitted at this time is far superior to the one which was submitted two years ago, and which was vetoed by President Harding, and in view of the fact that the veterans themselves, through their own organization, have expressed a preference for this bill, I am convinced that, as a friend of the veterans, I am in duty bound to vote for it just as it has been reported by the committee.

Furthermore, I wish to say concerning the reference that the Senator from Tennessee has made to the loaning provision under the bill which was sent to President Harding that that was a pawnbrokers' proposition. The veteran would have received very little money under that bill. He would have received 4½ per cent from the Government and probably would have been compelled to pay 15 or 25 per cent for 50 per cent of the amount of money which was due him, and that would have ended the whole proposition. This bill is a far better bill. There is no chance under this bill for the veteran to be defrauded out of anything to which he is entitled, while there was such an opportunity under the bill which was vetoed by President Harding as it passed the Congress two years ago.

Mr. President, a few moments ago I was about to discuss the justification for the passage of this bill. I regard it as based upon at least a strong moral obligation. The discrimination on account of the \$20 bonus paid to other Government employees, the deduction from the soldier's wage of the Government insurance premiums, the deduction without his consent of the enforced allotments, which amounted to \$200,000,000, the practical coercion of the veterans immediately preceding the war in obtaining subscriptions for Liberty bonds, all justify the payment of adjusted compensation to the soldiers of the World War.

As to Liberty bond subscriptions, the veterans paraded in camps and anyone failing to subscribe was publicly disgraced for so failing. They did subscribe and payment was made by deducting in monthly installments \$5, and in some cases \$10, from the soldier's wage until the bonds were paid for. The veterans sold those bonds for 20 and 25 per cent less than what they were obliged to pay. I submit, Mr. President, that it is unfair to ask a citizen not only to fight for his country, to hazard his life, and at the same time to finance out of his meager wage a part of the cost of the war.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. BURSUM. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I should like to know from the Senator, if he can give the information, how general that practice was? I have known that that occurred a good many times among the people in various communities, but I was not aware that the Government had resorted to the practice of disgracing soldiers who would not subscribe according to the program laid down.

Mr. BURSUM. I had definite information of that fact two years ago.

Mr. NORRIS. It seems to me that is a course of conduct that can not be defended.

Mr. BURSUM. I had a number of affidavits regarding the matter; I have not those affidavits at the present time.

Mr. NORRIS. I wondered if that were general, or was it confined to some particular camp?

Mr. BURSUM. It was quite general.

Mr. SMOOT. I never heard of it before.

Mr. NORRIS. I never heard of it before, but if it be true—and, of course, I accept the Senator's statement that it is true—the practice can not be defended or excused of deducting from the wages of men who were enlisted monthly sums in order to pay for bonds against their consent.

Mr. BURSUM. If bonds are sold in public before the whole world and the soldiers are lined up and are called upon to subscribe, the Senator will understand how many of them if they failed to subscribe would feel humiliated and disgraced.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I can see that plainly.

Mr. BURSUM. Furthermore, the officers were taking a hand in the selling of the bonds. I say that that was a loss the veteran ought not to suffer. It was wrong.

Mr. President, for these reasons, and on account of those particular items, I justify the passage of an adjusted compensation act. To my mind, it would have been better for the world had the items to which they are entitled been identified in the bill so that the world might know why we made this adjustment; but that has not been done so far as the form is concerned, and I do not know that, after all, it makes any great difference, for the amount is substantially what they would have been entitled to. The form of the bill is not the ordinary form that a debtor would submit to a creditor; but, as I have heretofore stated, the form of settlement has the approval of the organizations in this country representing the ex-service men, and we have, I think, perfect justification in accepting that approval in good faith and at par value.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. BURSUM. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator believe that the rank and file of the ex-service men are opposed to a cash bonus?

Mr. BURSUM. Oh, I would not say that they are; no.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does not the Senator believe that the rank and file of the ex-service men of the country are in favor of a cash bonus—90 per cent to 95 per cent, maybe 99 per cent of them?

Mr. BURSUM. To tell the truth, Mr. President, I have not canvassed the rank and file. I have not talked with them. They are too numerous.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have, and the Senator will probably hear from them before this is over.

Mr. BURSUM. Perhaps the Senator from Tennessee is acquainted with all of the ex-service men of this country. Perhaps he has facilities for knowing and being possessed of better information; but so far as I am concerned I should say that the information coming from their representatives ought to be considered pretty representative and reliable.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico further yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BURSUM. I do.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then, as I understand the Senator, on the basis of the recommendation of the representatives of the ex-service men, he is going to vote against a cash bonus at this time, and he is opposed to it, and is speaking against it?

Mr. BURSUM. I am going to vote for the bill as it comes from the committee, as reported by the committee. Of course, if the Senate should pass a cash bonus and the House should pass it I should still be for it, because I am for a settlement of this matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. But, Mr. President, the Senator is against it now? I am interested in the attitude of the Senator.

Mr. BURSUM. I am against it for the reason that unless we do take this bill, in my judgment, Congress will pass no bill—

Mr. McKELLAR. And therefore the Senator is opposed to the cash bonus now?

Mr. BURSUM. And I am not in favor of keeping the bonus question as an eternal issue, forever; and I say, Mr. President, that it is not for the public welfare that 4,000,000 men should feel a grievance against their Government. We ought to close out this matter and have it settled, and unless it is settled now I fear that we will never pass legislation on the subject.

Mr. KING subsequently said: Mr. President, in order that I may do no injustice to my esteemed friend from New Mexico I have had the Reporter transcribe the sentence to which I called attention a moment or two ago.

The sentence is as follows:

I do not believe in that doctrine, but I do say that the representatives of the ex-service men have a right to speak and to say what they desire, and to give their approval.

To which doctrine I most cordially assent.

Then follows this sentence of the able Senator:

They have given their approval of the pending bill, and we have a right to be amenable to their judgment, and not to set up our own personal judgment as against the judgment of the organizations which represent the ex-service men of the country.

I submit that the proper interpretation of the statement of the Senator is that we have no right to have a judgment of our own upon this question in opposition to that entertained by representatives of the ex-service men of the United States. Of course, I may say, if the Senator will pardon me, that if we should apply that principle to all legislative matters we would become mere automatons. We should have no judgment whatever adverse to the judgment of interests that might be the proponents of legislation. I fancy that there would be some difficulty in the mind of the Senator from New Mexico in determining which way to vote if there were adverse interests, and I am rather curious to know what his position would be in such a case.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a letter directed to me by Mr. Sperry, the head of the Private Soldiers' and Sailors' Legion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The letter is as follows:

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS PRIVATE SOLDIERS AND SAILORS'
LEGION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., April 22, 1924.

Hon. GEORGE W. NORRIS,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In behalf of the Private Soldiers and Sailors' Legion, an organization of former enlisted men of the United States Army, which it is my honor to represent, I am impelled to protest against the so-called soldiers' bonus bill now pending before the Senate as wholly inadequate and unrepresentative of the wishes of those who served well and faithfully their Nation in its hour of need.

That bill is a straight insurance policy proposition—nothing else. Its loan features are merely those pertaining to any life-insurance policy, and the veteran who by accident, disease, or bad fortune is forced to borrow on the policy will lose the insurance. It covers none of the ground of a disability pension, although if the veterans accept it they will relinquish any claim they may have to disability pensions.

The impression that has been gained by hundreds of thousands of deserving veterans is that Congress throughout this entire so-called "bonus" discussion has been motivated by other than a straightforward desire to deal with the matter, with the candor and sincerity it commands.

Instead of dealing fairly and justly with the soldiers, this bill, on its face, is a palpable subterfuge. Without any desire to criticize unjustly, or to asperse the good faith of Members who are supporting this bill simply because they believe it is the best legislation that can be secured, I am constrained to express the deliberate conviction that the measure is simply an effort to give the veterans a minimum of benefits, with total disregard of the justice of their claims.

The bill is undesirable from the standpoint of the soldiers themselves and from the broader public interest.

It gives the soldiers something they do not want and imposes upon the public a wholly unnecessary burden.

It is conceded by proponents of the pending measure that its cost to the Federal Treasury will aggregate approximately \$4,000,000,000.

This organization has consistently advocated that the men who made up the American armies shall be paid, as adjusted compensation, a lump sum of \$500.

The immediate outlay that would be entailed by the adoption of this demand would be \$2,000,000,000.

Were this sum borrowed by the Government and amortized over a period of 20 years, its total under no circumstances would exceed \$3,000,000,000, or \$1,000,000,000 less than will be expended to defray the cost of the unsatisfactory insurance plan.

Adjusted compensation was originally designed by Congress and claimed as right by the service men as an adjustment for their losses during the war period. It was an adjustment for what had taken place, but an adjustment for all time to come. The bill before your honorable body practically abandons any thought of payment for the economic loss of the veteran during the war and offers him instead a chance to quitclaim all disability and pension rights for himself and dependents for the future.

In its essentials it is not an adjusted compensation bill at all but a palpable blow at war-risk insurance and disability claims that are due to develop from year to year.

If Congress seeks sincerely to respond to the overwhelming wish of the soldiers of the World War—especially the enlisted men who gave so much for so little in return—it will incorporate into the pending measure a provision whereby those who desire may accept in lieu of insurance a cash adjustment of \$500. This option should be accorded as a matter of right and justice.

Soldiers who cheerfully responded to their country's call to fight for its safety and the liberty of the world are entitled to their Government's guaranty of their economic liberty which will permit them a voice in the determination of the form in which that Government shall acquit its obligation to them.

I respectfully and very earnestly appeal to you to use your great influence to secure an amendment to the pending bill that will make it possible for the veterans themselves to say whether they desire a cash adjustment of their former sacrifices or a reward which can not be recovered during their lifetime.

It scarcely needs argument to demonstrate that these veterans will not be greatly impressed with the generosity or the justice of a law that grants them something which they must die to claim.

Respectfully yours,

[SEAL] MARVIN GATES SPERRY,
National President Private Soldiers and Sailors' Legion.

Mr. GOODING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record two telegrams from Legion organizations in my State, asking for the passage of the bill now before the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BRUCE. I object to any reading of telegrams on this subject, whether they are in favor of the bonus or whether they are against it.

Mr. GOODING. Does the Senator object to their being printed in the Record?

Mr. BRUCE. No; not at all.

Mr. GOODING. That is all I have asked—that they be printed in the Record.

Mr. BRUCE. I beg the Senator's pardon; I misunderstood him.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no objection, the telegrams will be printed in the Record. The Chair hears none.

The telegrams are as follows:

BOISE, IDAHO, April 19, 1924.

Hon. F. R. GOODING,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Thousands of ex-service men favor adjusted compensation bill as passed by House and reported by Senate Finance Committee. We are against any amendments from floor of Senate, and urge you to oppose such, particularly cash option. We are placing our hope and trust in you to support bill as reported by Senate Finance Committee.

LESTER F. ALBERT, Department Adjutant.

IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO, April 19, 1924.

Senator FRANK GOODING,
Washington, D. C.:
The American Legion Auxiliary, Department of Idaho, pleads for your support on the adjusted compensation bill as passed by Senate Finance Committee. You oppose from the floor all amendments, especially cash option. By so doing will win the greatest respect of 2,000 members in this State.

MRS. JENNIE BRANDL,
Department President.

Mr. FERNALD. Mr. President, in opposing the bonus, or so-called adjusted compensation bill, I feel it my duty to state the reasons for so doing.

I am sure no man in this country more fully appreciates the splendid and patriotic service of the American soldier on the battlefields of France than I. Indeed, I would not confine this appreciation to the soldier on the battlefields of France; but

the American soldier has never been found wanting in loyalty, patriotism, or courage in any of the wars from the day of Washington to Pershing, and for this we owe them endless homage. No man feels more indebted to or more interested in the welfare of the ex-service men than I, but in a matter of so great import our judgment must be based upon something more than mere sentiment or a desire to express ourselves by waving the American flag and singing psalms of praise of our accomplishments on the fields of battle.

This is not only a question of patriotism; it is also a question of commerce, on which the prosperity of our country depends; and just how the 112,000,000 people of the United States are to be affected by legislation of this character must be taken into consideration. It is only fair in presenting this case to make some comparisons of what our Government has done in the past as well as what it may properly do now in establishing a precedent for the future.

In presenting these facts I do not wish to be understood to imply that too much has been done for the soldier of the late war.

I indorse every movement toward making more comfortable and providing for the disabled who served on the battle field. To quote a great general, "War is hell," and anything a government can do to lessen its evils should and will be done by the people of our country.

While the late war was the most destructive in the annals of history, and fought on a scale of warfare hitherto unknown, yet it is doubtful if the actual suffering inflicted was any greater than that experienced by the soldiers of Washington or Grant. We now have greater facilities for providing them with food and drink; a better provision of ambulance and hospital service, while various organizations on the battle field give first aid and minister to the needs of the soldiers. War prisoners are treated less brutally than in earlier days. While it has been said that comparisons are odious, they are sometimes necessary for explanation, and in the adjustment and settlement of a question so far-reaching as the one we have before us it is only fair to those who early fought for the flag of this Republic to state the conditions under which they fought and the compensation which they received. In the consideration of the bill now before the Senate I wish to call attention to the attitude of Congress and the public with reference to the original acts and those presented at this time.

The first soldiers' pension legislation ever proposed in this country was prepared and passed by the Colony of Virginia in 1624; but this failed to become a law because it was not ratified by the Government in England. The first pension legislation actually enacted into law in this country was passed by the Plymouth Colony in 1636. Gradually each of the colonial governments passed some sort of crude pension legislation. These laws were all general in their terms, not fixing any amount to be paid to the soldiers, but leaving the amount of each pension to be determined by local courts and the funds to be raised by local taxation.

It is interesting to note that all of the colonial pension legislation was enacted for the purpose of inducing or encouraging settlers to fight the Indians, and generally these laws provided that no soldiers could receive their benefits except such as were so disabled as to become public charges or objects of charity. No soldier who was merely wounded or injured in defending the Colonies against the Indians or against their enemies in other Colonies was considered eligible for a pension unless his injuries or disabilities were of such a nature as to render him incapable of earning a living and make him a public charge.

As the Revolutionary War approached—and, indeed, after it had been in progress for some time—the Continental Congress failed or refused to enact soldiers' relief legislation until some of the States, particularly Virginia and Pennsylvania, passed laws of their own making liberal provision for disabled soldiers and for the widows of those who were slain.

On August 26, 1776, the Continental Congress passed the first Nation's pension law in the United States. This act allowed half pay for life or during disability to every officer, soldier, or sailor losing a limb in battle or being so disabled in the service of the Government as to render him incapable of earning a living.

The administration of the act, as well as its enforcement, was left entirely to the different State governments. They were to examine the applications of their own soldiers, pay the pension to those who were found qualified, and deduct the amount paid from the State's quota due to the Federal Government.

There was a further act passed for the encouragement of enlistments. Commissioned officers, when disabled so as to be wholly incapable of earning a livelihood, were allowed half

pay during life. Privates and noncommissioned officers, when so disabled as to be wholly incapable of earning a living, were allowed \$5 a month, with proportionate allowance for partial disability.

There is some criticism of the delay of Congress in enacting legislation, but it may be interesting to know that the Continental Congress were considering legislation of this character from the beginning of the war until May 15, 1778, when a bill was passed granting adjusted compensation in the face of repeated warnings from Washington that unless such legislation was enacted the Army would be deprived of its officers and unfit to fight. The bill was then deferred, however, and a compromise made limiting the half-pay gratuity of officers to the period of seven years after the end of the war.

This was the first bonus bill ever passed by Congress. So from the beginning of the Revolutionary War until the act of April 24, 1816, more than 40 years, no wounded or disabled soldier who fought to win our independence received a pension of more than \$5 a month, and that only in case of disability, which disqualified him for the performance of manual labor. Not until 1818, 42 years after the beginning of the Revolutionary War, was any person allowed a pension except for injuries or disability incurred in the service, and for more than 53 years no widow of a soldier who served in the war for independence was ever allowed a pension.

In the War of 1812 soldiers receiving total disability received but \$5 a month until the act of 1816, which increased their pension to \$8 a month, this applied also to the soldiers of the Revolution.

The soldiers of the War of 1812 received pension only for disability incurred in the service until 1871, or more than 60 years after the war. At that time a bill passed Congress granting a pension of \$8 per month during life to all soldiers survivors of the war. No widow of the soldier of the War of 1812 received a pension until 1816, when, by act, the widows of the soldiers of that war who were killed in the service were allowed half pay. In the Mexican War no soldier except those who were wounded or disabled received a pension until 1877, 40 years after the close of the war.

On July 14, 1862, Congress passed what is known as the general pension law for the benefit of the soldiers of the Civil War and of subsequent wars and their dependents. But under that act only soldiers who incurred disabilities in the service as a direct result of the performance of military duty were entitled to pension. Pensions for Civil War veterans remained substantially the same under this law until the act of June 27, 1890, when the first Civil War service pension law was enacted. So that no soldier of the Civil War who was not injured or disabled by military service received any pension from the Government until the act of 1890, 25 years after the close of the war.

Now, this bill provides payment of a bonus to all veterans who served in the World War, regardless of disability or nature of service. I would not suggest that they wait 25 years before they be given attention, but that they receive compensation in a reasonable time, or when our Government again shall have returned to a normal commercial basis. But based on the Civil War schedule it would be 25 years before they received a pension. This I would deem unreasonable because our great country will return to normal much more rapidly now than at the time when the Government was itself upset by Civil War, and a united people can restore normal conditions much more quickly than when rent asunder by internal dissension.

Under the act of June 27, 1890, all the soldiers of the Civil War who served 90 days or more and who were suffering from mental or physical disability of a permanent character which incapacitated them for the performance of manual labor in such degree as to render them unable to earn a support received a pension not exceeding \$12 a month and not less than \$6 according to their degree of inability. Under this act soldiers who served 90 days and who were unable to earn their support were entitled to the pension, and it was not necessary that their disability should be of service origin. These rates were increased in 1907 to \$12 per month for those 62 years of age, \$15 for those 70 years of age, and \$20 for those 75 years of age.

On May 11, 1912, Congress passed an act known as age and service act, under which pensions were granted in varying amounts, according to age and length of service, ranging from \$13 a month for those who were 62 years of age to \$30 a month for those who were 75 years of age and had served three years. Finally, the act of May 1, 1920, known as the Fuller Act, granted pensions to all Civil War veterans who served 90 days, without regard to age or length of service, of \$50 per month. And the recent so-called Bursum Act grants pensions of \$72 a month to all Civil War veterans. But of course all the Civil

War veterans are now approaching or have passed 80 years of age.

I have endeavored to present as nearly as possible—without going into detail as to the widows, children, and so forth, of the different wars—the pension legislation since the first war of the Republic. I shall now insert a table showing detailed amounts paid out by the Government in pensions for all of the different wars.

Revolutionary War	\$70,000,000
War of 1812	46,094,572
Indian wars	20,017,919
Mexican War	54,471,001
Civil War	5,749,030,456
War with Spain and Philippine insurrection	76,007,833
Regular Establishment	57,302,421
Unclassified	18,508,447
World War	99,402
Total	8,089,531,551

It will be readily observed that the United States Government has never been niggardly or penurious with its defenders but has always been liberal and just, and it may be depended upon now, as always, to do its full duty toward those who carried arms in its defense.

Let me also insert the amount paid per month for food and clothing by the armies in the great World War.

	Private	Corporal	Sergeant	Regimental sergeant major
Australia	\$43.50	\$72.90	\$70.50	\$94.80
New Zealand	36.60			
Canada	33.00	36.00	45.00	54.00
United States	30.00	36.00	38.00	51.00
Great Britain	11.40	15.30	19.20	24.60
Germany	3.00	9.00	15.00	18.30
France	1.50	2.52	6.00	13.20
Austria-Hungary	.96	1.80		
Japan	.78	3.32	8.90	9.90
Italy	.58	1.45	9.55	25.19

This proves what I have endeavored to show, that our Government paid nearly three times as much as Great Britain, ten times as much as Germany, twenty times as much as France, thirty times as much as Austria, forty times as much as Japan, and nearly sixty times as much as Italy.

I do not contend that we have done too much; and in every instance where appropriations have been asked for disabled men, invalids, or for the building of hospitals, I have very gladly given my support, and shall continue to do so. We can not do too much for those who have lost limbs or health; but to those robust, husky young men, whose experience overseas has made them even better citizens, as many of them write me that it did, no bonus should be granted. It is no time now to discourage or dishearten those patriotic citizens who because of age or lack of health were left at home and did their full duty in working the farms and the industries. Their service was just as important for the carrying on of the war as the bearing of arms overseas in defense of the Republic. The soldiers had to be fed; they had to be clothed; they had to be furnished with arms, with munitions, and all the implements of warfare, and those men and women who worked and wrought diligently at home deserve the same consideration at the hands of the Government and of this Congress as their brothers and sons who went overseas.

I have endeavored to show that these boys have received more generous treatment by the Government than their sires and grandsires who fought for liberty and the Union in former wars ever received. Now what seems to me the best thing for the boys—and I know a large number of them agree with me in this—is to see to it that our industries are kept active, that our Government expenses be kept as low as consistent, that economy be practiced in the management and affairs of our Government, and then at the proper time, when our Government is in financial condition, that they be adequately, yes, liberally compensated.

I am sure that every good citizen has a feeling of the highest respect for those who served the country in time of war; and those 4,500,000 who constituted the American Army are not a distinct group that can be segregated from those more than 100,000,000 civilians. They are indeed an integral part of the social and economical affairs of the Nation. They are taxpayers and voters. Whatever contributes to the national welfare is for their best interests, as they have the obligations of citizenship. If the burden of taxation can be lightened and the public debt reduced, it helps them, as a part of the great body of American citizens.

It is impossible to tell from the best actuaries the exact cost of a bonus bill. The Senate Finance Committee in 1922 estimated the probable cost to be somewhere near \$4,000,000,000, the maximum to be \$4,486,000,000. But these estimates are very far from covering the actual cost, because these figures do not include the expense of administering such a bill. It has been well estimated that it would require at least 2,000 employees. The expense of this army of workers would be something more than \$20,000 a day for probably the next 50 years, basing the estimate upon the expense of the Civil War. Neither is there any room in Washington for such an army as this to function, and it would be absolutely necessary to erect buildings, because an army like this would occupy at least 95,000 feet of office space; so that it is reasonable to expect that the maximum cost of this bill would be more than \$5,000,000,000.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. FERNALD. I yield.

Mr. KING. The Senator referred to 2,000 employees. My recollection of the testimony is that the 2,000 additional employees were required by the War and Navy Departments merely for the purpose of obtaining the names of the soldiers. As to the number that will be required for the administration of this bill, no one, so far as I can remember the testimony, ventured to hazard a guess. Instead of 2,000, in my judgment it would be greatly in excess of 2,000, and the cost of the administration of this bill, conservatively stated, I think, would be from \$10,000,000 to \$20,000,000 annually.

Mr. FERNALD. There is no doubt but that the Senator is correct. I made a very careful estimate as to the number now engaged in the war service, but these men are even better adapted to that work, and on the basis the Senator suggests it doubtless would begin with more than twice that number. But I wanted to be very conservative in all my figures. I think it is an exceedingly conservative estimate to say that for the next 50 years it would cost more than \$20,000 per day. So Senators can get some small idea of the amount of the expense involved in administering this bill.

If this bill is passed, it must be acknowledged that provision for administration must be taken into consideration. There are already 3,400,000 people on the Government pay roll, and on this basis each 11 workers in the United States are paying the salary of 1 Government employee.

Is it possible that now the Congress of the United States, in this year of our Lord 1924, desires to increase the number of employees of the Government and make the burden of taxation even higher than at the present time? We have listened sympathetically to the distressed condition of the farmer, and I share with those who have brought these conditions to the attention of Congress the belief that what has been said of his burdens is all too true. They are burdened and deserve speedy relief. But are we now to impose another burden of \$4,000,000,000 or \$5,000,000,000, which they must share, on our citizens and make taxation even higher than at present?

We have made marvelous progress in the past four years in the adjustment of our financial problems. The national debt, which but a few years since was nearly \$29,000,000,000, has been reduced to \$21,600,000,000 on March 31, 1924. This has been accomplished largely through the efforts and wisdom of that greatest Secretary of the Treasury in my time, Andrew W. Mellon. In every crisis Providence seems to intervene and bring forward the man for the place. And Mr. Mellon's master mind has worked out scientifically a plan for the reduction of taxes which if adopted will straightway put this country on its feet. I can not speak too highly of his service to this Nation. I am not personally acquainted with Mr. Mellon. I have spoken to him but once in my life. I speak of him in an impersonal way, and what I have to say will be from a general knowledge of his activities in the office which he holds. But I can not forego the opportunity to say that the service he has rendered to the taxpayers of this country is a service which should be recognized. He is an authority on the great problems of finance, and the tax-revision plan which he suggests is so closely connected with the question under discussion that I can not discuss the one without touching on the consequences of the other.

There are those who believe that we may pass a bonus bill and still reduce taxes. I can not understand the philosophy of such argument. There are those who say that if we defer the payment of the bonus for 20 years, the Government can still reduce taxes as suggested by the Secretary of the Treasury. To me this is a puerile statement. As a matter of fact,

the longer we defer the payment of any bonus, the more it will cost the Government. I think I can agree with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] that if it must be paid, the sooner it is paid the less it will cost. But how can we incur an indebtedness from three to five billion dollars and still reduce taxes if we are to go on reducing our indebtedness as we ought to do? The indebtedness of the Government at this time, a little more than \$21,000,000,000, can be reduced fully one-half, in my judgment, in the next 10 years in case this bill be not enacted. We have already adjusted our indebtedness from Great Britain of nearly \$5,000,000,000 and have the same arrangement with a few other smaller governments; and I believe we are now in the way of a settlement with the larger powers. If this can be consummated it will bring us back to a financial standing whereby we can begin to pay reasonable pensions to those boys at a time when they will most need them.

As I have already stated, in all of the estimates of the cost of the plan no one has included the cost of administration. The total expense of all pensions paid up to June 30, 1921, to the veterans of all wars in which the United States has been engaged is something over \$6,000,000,000. The estimated maximum cost of the proposed bonus is a trifle more than \$5,000,000,000, which would be approximately 83 per cent of the total pension payment made to all veterans of all previous wars during the life of the United States Government.

The extent of the expenditures made by the Federal Government during and since the World War for veterans and their dependents is indicated in the following table:

Vocational rehabilitation	\$589,866,370
Care of patients	258,572,840
Hospital facilities	51,695,000
Bonus on discharge (\$60 each)	250,239,900
Insurance	134,235,000
Compensation for death and disability	683,150,000
Military and naval family allowances	\$298,615,000
Administration	140,791,594
Total	2,413,165,704

The sum to be expended by the Veterans' Bureau during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, in the interest of the disabled of the World War is 13 per cent of the total national Budget and is a greater net sum than is spent by any other department or bureau of the Government. The total expenditures this fiscal year for veterans of all wars will amount to \$680,000,000, or approximately 20 per cent of the National Budget.

The Government's continuing interest in the disabled veterans is shown by the following activities carried on by the Veterans' Bureau: Vocational training is being given to 65,000 veterans, and nearly 50,000 have already been rehabilitated; 23,000 veterans are being cared for in hospitals; compensation for disabilities is being paid monthly to 180,000 veterans, and in addition there are 55,000 dependents of veterans receiving compensation for death.

A national bonus of \$60 awarded to every man upon discharge from the service totaled \$256,239,900. This, with the State bonus paid ex-service men, amounts to more than \$633,000,000, which has been paid or authorized. This sum is more than the combined bonus paid by England and France to their veterans for a service of 52 months' duration as against the 19 months' period in which our soldiers were actively engaged. More than 2,000,000 men of the American Army were enlisted six months or less before the armistice was signed, and few of these men left their training camps in this country.

At the beginning of the Great War the United States doubled the previous pay of our soldiers, paid out \$300,000,000 in allowances to families of men in the service, carried \$40,000,000 of life-insurance policies, and in addition the American people subscribed over \$460,000,000 for relief work through the Red Cross and other relief agencies. Appropriation bills carrying these amounts were gladly enacted into law by the American Congress, but these represented but a small part of the burdens carried by the American people. Old men who had long since retired from service, again engaged in the carrying on of the different industries; and particularly was this true with those engaged in farming. Young women from college returned to their homes and helped the old folks carry on the burdens made necessary by the absence of their brothers. Boys and girls of tender age were mustered into the service and were sent about offering Liberty loans and savings stamps, which were eagerly taken by every loyal and patriotic citizen of the Government.

These people should now have the same consideration as those of robust health and in the prime of life who have received no injury, but returned again to take up the responsibility of citizenship; and it is my firm belief that they, as well as all other citizens, will receive larger benefit by keeping

the industrial and commercial condition of the country along the same course we have been traveling than to upset the financial conditions, discourage business, and retard industry, because it is certainly true that if so large an amount of money is to be distributed among our people, it will encourage idleness and retard industrial activities, discourage the business of the country, and in the end work great hardship to those whom we desire to assist.

Citizenship in a democracy entails obligations, including that of military service; and while foreign governments insist upon military training in their youth, our Government has felt secure in the fact that in all wars of the past our young men have sprung to the defense of the flag with a patriotic spirit so noble and courageous that it has not been deemed necessary up to this time to insist upon military training. I am still convinced that that spirit exists to-day and will continue to exist, and that we need have no fears for the future, but that our young men of to-day and of to-morrow and for all time to come will continue to exhibit that splendid character and patriotism which has been the bulwark of our American institutions.

To my mind any monetary benefit for one who in the vigor of young manhood is engaged in gainful pursuit would be lost through the dislocation of our economic structure, the slowing down of industrial activity, and consequent lowering of wages and less opportunity for work. The disastrous effect of a bonus, in my judgment, would be the raising of the cost of living by causing an increase of buying and a decrease of production, which would benefit those who have a stock of commodities to sell but would impose a corresponding hardship upon those in limited or straitened circumstances.

Once more I wish to state that I believe I have given sufficient reasons why the bonus bill, so called, should not be enacted into law. I favor a reduction of taxes because it seems to me necessary in order to maintain the prosperity of our Government. Reduce appropriations, reduce the number of Government employees, hold strictly to a budget, live within our reasonable means, and we will have reduced taxation. This I believe is the urgent and ardent desire of every American.

I can not close without stating that in the hundreds of letters I have received from the splendid boys in Maine who saw overseas service a majority of them favor my attitude in this matter and have approved my course. This I say as a deserved compliment to the boys of my State.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, I do not desire to make a speech on the subject at this time, as I explained my views quite fully when the bill was up before. I merely want to state that the origin of the idea of a bonus or adjusted compensation was not with the soldier, but elsewhere. Personally, I am opposed to a bonus or adjusted compensation for able-bodied soldiers.

We have seen that the experts differ greatly as to the cost of the two plans—cash or insurance. It is claimed that under the cash-option plan it would cost the Government about \$1,500,000,000, while under the insurance plan it would cost about \$4,000,000,000. I feel that the bill as now drawn, comprising the insurance plan, is a makeshift. Since we have to take a choice between these two plans, I expect to vote for the cash option, and then I shall vote against the bill.

Of course, there is nothing too good for the Government to give to the wounded and disabled soldier and his dependents. I realize that the bill will pass in some shape; and if it does pass, it ought to be not a politicians' bill, but a bill expressing gratitude to the soldier. If the Government owes the boys, it ought to pay them, and they ought not to be treated like minors and have payment deferred to such a far-distant day as is provided in the pending makeshift measure.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] said yesterday that there were 20 opponents of the soldiers' bonus on this side of the Chamber. I do not know whether that enumeration is correct or not, and I care but little. If there are 20 on this side of the Chamber who are antagonistic to the measure, I am one of the 20. If there are only two, I am one of the two; and if there is only one, I am he. Never in my life have I formed stronger or deeper convictions in relation to any subject than I have with respect to the subject of the soldiers' bonus.

So far as our soldiers during the World War were called upon to do their duty they did it faithfully and well. I doubt whether any soldiers in the history of the United States have ever been endowed with a higher degree of discipline and military training than were they. At St. Mihiel, in the Argonne, at Chateau Thierry, they showed that they were worthy of their sires who participated in the Battles of Long Island and

the Cowpens, of Lundy's Lane and New Orleans, of Chancellorsville and Gettysburg. Nothing could induce me to say a word in the slightest degree derogatory to the military character of the brave men who saw actual service during the World War in the lousy trenches of France or on its blood-soaked plains. But, Mr. President, the first obligation of every man is to the truth; it is that, we are told, which makes us free.

The fact is that except to the limited extent that he was actually involved in war no American soldier has ever had a slighter claim to a bonus than has the American soldier of the World War. Nearly one-half of our World War soldiers never left our shores at all; nearly one-half of them never did anything but don a uniform and go through military exercises on the training field. Only 50,280 of them perished upon the battle field or from wounds received in battle. Little Belgium lost twice as many. After the Battle of Gettysburg more men were found to be killed, wounded, and missing than were found to be killed, wounded, and missing during the whole World War. Even after Chickamauga, a battle not of the same bloody dignity as Gettysburg, some 34,000 men were ascertained to be killed, wounded, or missing.

Never in the whole history of the world was any body of soldiers maintained in such a high degree of physical comfort as were our World War soldiers. Indeed, thousands of them were maintained in a far higher degree of physical comfort than they had ever been in their own homes. The average term of service of the American soldier during the World War was only one year. To many of them the war was simply a valuable school of instruction and an agreeable recreation field.

Of course, I would not have a feeling heart if I did not entertain the keenest sense of sympathy with, and the deepest sense of gratitude to, every American soldier who was disabled by sickness contracted, or by wounds received, in the World War. Every such soldier is entitled not simply to a sentimental recognition, but, so long as his disability lasts, to pecuniary support from the Federal Treasury. And when was the disabled soldier ever so generously dealt with as he has been dealt with by our Government? The Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] pointed out a few moments ago that in the year 1922 the expenditures of the Veterans' Bureau were some \$479,000,000, and in the year 1923 some \$470,000,000. Altogether, since the World War we have expended no less than two and a quarter billion dollars in taking care—the tenderest care—of our World War disabled soldiers; and it is thought by the Treasury Department that the acme of our annual disbursements on behalf of our disabled veterans has not yet been reached. We have founded homes and hospitals for their physical relief; we have established a system of pecuniary compensation for their material succor. We have even devised a system of vocational training for their restoration to the active pursuits of life. But for the able-bodied young soldier, in the prime of physical life, who comes to the Senate or to the House of Representatives at this time, when the whole people of the United States are solicitous in the highest degree of bringing about some material degree of tax reduction, and asks for a mere gratuity, something akin to "the bread and the circus" for which the Roman populace clamored, I am bound to say that I for one have only a scant degree of consideration.

Five years or more have elapsed since the end of the World War. Never, except for a short period in 1921, has any country in the history of the human race been so prosperous as has been our country since that time. If there is any able-bodied American soldier of that war who has not reestablished himself in industrial or business life during this period and is really in need of a bonus, it must be either because he has not been willing to earn an honest living by his own manly exertions or has had no return of any kind to make to society for an income.

But, as I was saying, no soldier was ever better taken care of than was the American soldier during the World War. He was allowed \$30 a month if he was still in this country and \$33 a month if he was abroad. He was given his food and clothing free of charge, of course; he was given medical attendance of the very best kind free of charge; his life was insured at premiums far below the ordinary rates of insurance. If he had a wife an additional allowance of \$15 a month was made to him; if a wife and one child an additional allowance of \$20 a month; if a wife and two children an additional allowance of \$22.50 a month; if a wife and three children an additional allowance of \$30 a month; if a wife and more than three children an additional allowance of \$5 a month for every child in excess of three, until a maximum of \$50 was reached. Never has the pay of a private soldier so

closely approximated the highest wages paid to civilian workers in time of war.

What pay did the sturdy German soldier, whose courage, at least upon the field of battle, we must all admire, receive; what pay did the incomparable French soldier receive; what pay did the other soldiers of continental countries receive? That of the German soldier was only \$3 a month; that of the Belgian soldier only \$2 a month; that of the French soldier only \$1.45 a month; that of the Czechoslovakian soldier only \$1.45 a month. In other words, the American soldier received ten times the pay that the German soldier did and twenty times the pay that the French soldier did.

Mr. President, I propose to say but little on this occasion with respect to the moral side of the question under discussion. I addressed myself to that when I spoke in this Chamber on this same subject some weeks ago. I may, however, say that I was astonished to hear the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BURSUM] exclaim today, "No; this bill is not clothed with the form of the ordinary relationship of debtor and creditor"; and I was equally astonished to hear the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] say yesterday that the old idea that it was the duty of a soldier to give his services freely to his country, without regard to the adequacy of his compensation, was an exploded one. These statements, it appears to me, are rooted in a complete misconception of the true nature of the military obligation. That obligation does not rest upon contract; it does not belong to the province of bargaining and selling. It springs from the paramount allegiance that every citizen owes to the country that has borne him or that has sheltered him when he was born elsewhere than within its confines. When his country calls and the trumpet sounds, and—

The sweet clarion's breath

Stirs the soldier's scorn of death—

he has no right to ask whether that country will pay him a liberal wage or not.

Some time ago an insulting miscreant wrote to me a letter censuring my stand with respect to the soldiers' bonus, and asking me whether I would have gone into the war as a soldier for \$30 a month. "Yes," I replied; "at 30 cents or 3 cents a month." My Confederate kinsmen served for very little more in the last stages of the Civil War, and yet I can truly affirm that when the unpensioned soldiers of the South issued from that war and moved about again among their neighbors they were respected and honored and beloved as no soldier ever will be who receives such a squalid gratuity as that for which this bill provides.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. BRUCE. A little later, if the Senator will allow me. The last time I spoke on this subject the continuity of my remarks was so broken by interruptions that I scarcely recognized them afterwards when I read them in the Record. A little later I shall gladly yield to questions.

The force of all this is felt by the friends of this bill. "But, no," they say, "we are not asking for any monetary reward for our military services. We are not seeking any pecuniary compensation for our patriotic exertions. We are requesting only that our pay during the World War shall be increased to such an extent as to put us upon a footing of pecuniary parity with the civilian worker in the United States during the World War."

Why, then, I ask, does this bill provide that the soldier during the World War who never left our shores shall be compensated at the rate of \$1 a day and that the soldier who faced the bayonet and machine gun in France shall be compensated at the rate of \$1.25 a day? To what can that difference be attributable except to a recognition of the fact that the soldier who saw service in France incurred military sacrifices and hardships that the cis-Atlantic American soldier never incurred?

No; such a distinction as that is beyond the reach of human subtlety or casuistry. What is being sought here is a pecuniary compensation, and one so eagerly sought that beyond doubt the great majority of our ex-service men would far rather receive a cash bonus than an insurance bonus.

In this connection I might further say that if the compensation sought by this bill is in truth nothing but such a compensation, as the probonus soldier contends, it is a mere mockery to speak of it as "adjusted compensation." The bill is utterly arbitrary, illogical, and unequal in the distribution of its benefits. Except as respects the distinction, of which I have already spoken, between the American soldier who is to receive only \$1 a day and the American soldier who is to receive only \$1.25 a day, this bill makes no sort of distinction between the differ-

ent classes of American soldiers who saw service in the World War.

It makes none, to begin with, between the young soldier who volunteered at the very beginning of the war and offered all that was precious in his life upon the altar of his country and the draftee who did not volunteer only because he had good domestic or other reasons for not doing so, and the reluctant draftee who never would have seen service at all if he could have helped it and who was dragged into the war as a cat might be drawn backward across the surface of a carpet. Nor does the bill draw any distinction between the service man who had a wife and child that worked at high wages in some munition or other factory during the war and the service man who had no such wife or child to add to the family income; nor between the service man whose family was assisted by friends or relations during the war while he was in the Army and the service man whose family received no such assistance; nor between the skilled artisan who was earning anywhere from \$5 to \$8 a day and the unskilled laborer who was earning only, say, \$1 a day when the call to the colors came; nor between the unskilled laborer who was earning, say, \$1 a day when this call went out and the youth or shiftless fellow who was earning nothing a day at that time; nor between the soldier who came back to the United States scarred with honorable but disabling wounds and the soldier who never smelt a whiff of powder except in camp from one end of the war to the other; nor between the soldier who has received a State bonus and the soldier who has received none; nor between the soldier who went into the Army as early as 1917, before the era of high wages began, and the soldier who did not go into the Army until 1918, after he had been receiving high wages as a civilian worker; nor between the private soldier who lost \$1 to \$8 a day by becoming a soldier and the officer who lost an income of \$2,500 to \$25,000 a year by becoming an officer.

So it will be seen, as I have said, that the bill is based on no fair, no just, no equitable principle of apportionment and that is a mere abuse of terms to speak of such compensation as that for which it provides as "adjusted compensation." Moreover, Mr. President, in instituting this comparison between the pay of the soldier and the wages of the civilian worker during the war there are other things, Mr. President, that we must not forget.

Of all the soldiers who constituted class 1 during the World War, 87 per cent were single men—that is to say, without any families to provide for—and of all the soldiers who made up the first draft, 63.5 per cent were unskilled laborers or mere office subordinates. And there is still another thing to remember: The civilian worker during the war has no pension to expect as time goes on—none whatever—but if the activity of the probonus soldier as shown in his relations to this bill is any augury of the future, he will be here 5 years hence, or 10 years hence, or 15 years hence, though I doubt whether his coming bill will be so long postponed, to ask for a service pension in addition to the donative for which he now asks.

Indeed, it is possible that before he comes asking for a service pension, he may solicit another bonus from Congress. He has already received a bonus in most of the States of the Union, for he has never stopped to ask to what source he really had a right to look for a bonus, whether to the State governments or to the National Government.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRUCE. He simply solved that question by applying to both governments for a bonus. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KING. I have received a communication from a soldier who came from a State where there was no State bonus, and he insists that a differentiation be made in this bill; that those soldiers who have not received a State bonus shall receive, under the terms of this bill, a larger bonus than those who came from the State-bonus States.

Mr. BRUCE. If such a thing as a sound principle could enter into a bonus bill at all, I should say that that man was right.

It may be that after these bonuses shall have been paid out of the State and National Treasuries, the next demand of the probonus soldier will be for a contribution from the treasuries of the great cities of the country. Why not? Why should he not apply to the city as well as to the State of New York for a bonus, or to the city of Detroit as well as to the State of Michigan, or to the city of Chicago as well as to the State of Illinois? It is not such a long step from State and Federal bonuses to bonuses derived from the municipal subdivisions of the country.

So, I say, Mr. President, this bill is not defensible from any point of view, not from the military point of view nor

from the economic point of view. Nor is it defensible because of any precedent furnished by American history nor because of any analogy arising out of adjustments made by the Government after the World War with the railroads or contractors or others.

The junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] said that after the World War a bonus was given to our regular soldiers and sailors, and to all the employees of the Government who received salaries of less than \$2,500 a year. That statement, with due deference to the Senator, is not correct. Take the amount that was added to the salary of the Government employee. There was nothing retrospective about that. Commonly speaking, the amount is dubbed a "bonus," but it was not intended as a bonus. It was a mere increase of pay given to the faithful civil employees of the Government on account of the high cost of living that set in after the World War began.

And, let me ask you why, when the probonus soldier is seeking a proper standard for his compensation, he does not repair to the average pay of the Government employee during the World War, or to the average salary of the State teacher during the World War, rather than to the swollen wages of the arsenal worker or the shipyard worker, or of any other industrial worker during the World War? During the World War the average salary of the Government employee was only some \$895 a year, which, when expressed in the terms of the pre-war dollar, meant a purchasing power of only some \$567 a year; and the average salary of the State teacher during the same period was only some \$718 a year, which, when expressed in the terms of the pre-war dollar, was only some \$505 a year. Surely if these Federal employees and teachers could without repining submit patiently to such limited compensation, the soldier, with his much more exacting standards of professional obligation, should be able to submit to his Army pay with an even greater degree of patience.

The fact is that when the probonus soldier resorts to the inflated wages of the arsenal worker or the shipyard worker, or other industrial worker during the World War, for the standard of his compensation, he is finding his standard in the misfortunes of his country. That is what it comes to. Everybody knows that these high wages were paid because of the abnormal conditions created by the remorseless economic laws which operate during a state of war. The Government paid those wages only because it could not help itself. The Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] admitted that the other day in one of his speeches upon the subject of the bonus. The high wages paid by the Government to civilian workers during the war—some extorted by States—were just as much a part of the extraordinary losses of the war as the loss of life or property suffered by the American people on the battle field.

I say without hesitation that if the probonus soldier is disposed to set up the inflated wages of the civilian worker during the war as his standard of compensation, he runs the risk of having applied to him the term "profiteer," which he is so in the habit of applying to others.

To repeat, I am inflexibly, irrevocably opposed to this bill. It subverts the settled immemorial principles upon which the military obligation has always rested; it dishonors the military character; it tends to undermine in the future the morale and the efficiency of the American soldier. Already, it seems to me, a change has come over the character of our people in many fundamental respects in their attitude toward war. The attention of all of us has recently been called to a body of young college men in the Northwest who are contending that even when our country is invaded it should do nothing to repel the invader; but that we should, not to express myself too coarsely, turn not our faces, but our rumps, to the foe. The spirit of the people, it seems to me, is undergoing a profound alteration of which this bonus bill is but a symptom. The idea seems to have gotten abroad that the soldier is not bound to do anything that he is not paid, and abundantly paid, for.

If such a state of mind continues, the United States may simply not be able to go to war at all, because to the ordinary penalties that follow war—the waste of blood and the waste of treasure—would be added crushing contributions levied upon it by its own soldiers. If one of the accountants who has figured out the cost to be entailed by this bill is correct, it will mean a burden to the people of the United States of some \$3,600,000,000, a sum only a little less than the entire cost of the Civil War. Think of that, a bonus, a gratuity, almost tantamount to the entire cost of the Civil War! It is a sum in excess by \$2,500,000,000 of the indemnity that Germany wrung from France after the Franco-Prussian War, and equal to one-fifth or one-sixth of the enormous debt imposed upon this country by the World War.

If such burdens as these are to be placed upon the bowed back of the American people, perhaps they had all better become pacifists. The whole tendency of the bill is bad, and I wish I could believe that it does not denote some radical transformation in the character of our people.

There are many other things that I could say upon this subject, but I have said all that I have a right to say at this time. My vote will be cast against this bill even should it be the only one to be so cast.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, to those of us who are in favor of the bonus there are two propositions presented. One is the cash bonus, to be paid immediately, that would cost the Government about \$1,500,000,000. The other is the insurance plan, payable 20 years from now, that would cost the Government about \$4,500,000,000. I shall support the cash plan, because I believe the veterans prefer this plan; they are entitled to it, and I believe it is the best thing for the veterans, also our Government. Under the insurance plan the veterans will have to wait 20 years for the amount due them. The cash bonus will not only be a good thing for the veterans by giving them cash to pay on debts, make payments on buying a home or farm, but it will mean a saving of about \$2,000,000,000 to the Government. When the President signs the bill and it becomes a law, if we should pass the insurance plan, it would mean a financial liability of \$4,500,000,000, and that would have its effect on the sale of bonds that we issue.

It would be much easier for us to float \$1,500,000,000 in bonds and pay in cash to the soldiers who deserve it than it would be to have a deferred indebtedness of \$1,400,000,000. The Government can borrow money on its bonds at 3½ per cent, but under the provisions of the insurance plan the veterans will have to pay about 6 or 6½ to 7 per cent, or 2 per cent above the rediscount rate of the Federal reserve system. If the matter is settled on the insurance plan it means that it will be an issue in the political campaign this fall. The cash plan is going to be enacted during the next session of Congress if it is not during this session. I believe in settling the matter now and getting rid of it.

I am not going to be influenced by what the President may do or by what some other Senators may do about overriding the President's veto. They have their responsibilities, and I am not criticizing them in the least. The other day, when we voted on the Japanese-exclusion provision of the immigration law, we did not fail to vote because of what the President thought about it or whether he would veto the bill or because the Secretary of State advised us against its passage. We did not vote on that or any other question because of what certain Senators said or certain other people have said they will do under certain circumstances if we should pass the measure and then the President should do certain things. I am not going to allow my vote to be influenced in any such manner. The President has his responsibility and we have ours.

If we adopt the insurance plan, it means that there will be for 25 years at least 1,000 clerks employed in the administration of the law. It will cost hundreds of millions of dollars to carry out the provisions of the law; it will give great trouble to the veterans, and delay settlement with them. For these reasons and others the veterans prefer the cash to the insurance plan.

In my section of the country there are thousands of veterans who, if they could get a few hundred dollars in cash, could buy a small home or pay that amount on a small home or farm or on the debts that their fathers incurred while they were away during and after the war. If we allow them to borrow a certain amount under the insurance plan, it would be so small that it would not help them and would be wasted by some. The amount would be so small that they could not buy a home or anything very much. For that reason I think we ought to let them have it all in cash at one time. If the Government owes them, they should be paid in cash. Of course, the banks would benefit by the insurance plan and its adoption would mean a great deal to them. Mr. President, I visited the battle fields in France just after the armistice and I saw what the soldier boys had gone through. It is a wonder that any of them lived through it. As long as I am in the Senate or out of it, I am going to do what I can to help these brave boys.

I have no criticism of those Senators who want to make this a party measure; it is their responsibility; but I am glad to say that on this side of the Chamber Senators have not made it a party matter. We have had no caucus or conference, but each Senator is voting his own conscientious conviction.

I am not going to take more of the time of the Senate, because I hope we can get a vote to-day on the measure. I am in favor of the cash plan. I think some Senators here who have changed their minds about it have been misled. I know that the head of the American Legion is a splendid, brave, honorable man, and I think he, too, has been misled. Certainly, Senators ought to know what the legislative situation is. I shall vote for the cash plan, and if it carries and the President vetoes it, then I shall vote to override his veto.

If we fail in that, then we shall offer the insurance plan as an amendment to the tax bill, just as we did two years ago. No one can prevent us from doing it, and we will get a vote on the insurance plan at that time.

It is claimed by Senators who are now opposing the cash plan that we have sufficient votes to override the President's veto if he vetoes the insurance plan. There are a majority of Senators here who feel so much interest in passing some kind of legislation for the veterans that we will stay here until December if necessary. For my part I am not uneasy about that. Commander Quinn wired me as he did other Senators. The commander of the Legion of my State, a young man all Georgia is proud of, who has been a friend of mine, as was his father before him, honorable, brave people all of them, has also wired me. I went through my State last fall from March until December and I stated in speeches in every county that I believed in the cash bonus and gave the reasons that I have given here to-day. I feel sure that, regardless of what the leaders of the Legion may be lead to believe, 9 out of 10 of the soldiers of my State would prefer the cash plan, and I am going to vote for it on that account as well as for the reason that it is the best business plan and what the veterans wish. It will save the Government \$2,000,000,000 and it will save us hundreds of millions of dollars of expense in carrying out the provisions of the insurance plan. I hope that the plan that is incorporated in the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND], which leaves it optional for the veterans to select either the cash or the insurance plan, may be adopted. If that is defeated in the Senate or vetoed by the President, I shall actively support the insurance plan and will vote to override the President if he sees fit to veto either of the measures.

Mr. President, I have been in the Committee on Appropriations as a member of a subcommittee and have heard little of this debate, but I was fortunate in hearing the able, useful, and conscientious junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK]. He did not make a long speech; he never does; but he always says something worth while, and I agree with his splendid statement on this question. He does not make much noise, but he first started the Teapot Dome investigation as well as the meat packer—Kenyon-Kendrick—bill, besides other useful measures.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I do not intend now to discuss this subject with any degree of thoroughness or fullness. It is a very important subject. Some observations made by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BRUCE] lead me to state very briefly my position. It is well enough to be frank and candid and give the facts, so far as we can, as bearing upon the question.

I have before me a statement made November 17 last, somewhat out of date now, but I take it that the figures are substantially as they would be given now. The statistics compiled by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States show that the States have paid or have authorized to be paid, up to November 1, 1923, bonuses to World War veterans totaling \$380,600,000.

The bonus paid by the Government to the veterans at the time of their discharge from service aggregated \$270,000,000. This gives a total of \$650,600,000 in bonuses up to that time. The study of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States shows that 2,348,655 of the 4,582,393 men called to the service benefited by the bonuses paid or authorized by the States. There are some 19 States that have provided for a bonus. The others have not yet, and, so far as I know, there is no immediate prospect that they will provide any bonus.

The Senator from Maryland referred to the splendid treatment which the American soldier received from his Government, and I quite agree that never in any war in all history were the soldiers, as to their health, their physical well-being, their comfort, their care in every respect, so well looked after as were the American soldiers during the World War. That is to be said to our credit. It was no more, however, than we ought to have done and provided and furnished.

Some comment was made about the small pay of the soldiers of other countries as compared with the pay of the American soldier. No reference was made to what other countries have

done for their soldiers since the war. The statement to which I have just referred shows that the bonuses paid by other nations are as follows:

Great Britain	\$275,910,448
France	373,371,150
Canada	147,600,000
Australia	105,000,000
New Zealand	18,290,650
Belgium	10,522,250

So that other countries have shown some degree of consideration for their soldiers. Compared to their wealth and to their ability to pay, they have done measurably as well as we propose to do now.

I shall vote for the proposition, first for the cash plan. I agree with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] that there are two reasons for so doing. First, a great majority of the veterans would prefer that plan. The commander says that it ought not to be adopted, because it may endanger the measure entirely and perhaps defeat the whole plan and purpose. But he admits that the matter has not been submitted to the various posts and to the American Legion members individually or generally. I am quite sure that it means a great deal more to some of the former soldiers to have even a small amount of cash now than it would mean to have postponed for a period of years—perhaps 20 years—any benefit under the insurance plan contemplated by the legislation. That is the first reason.

The second reason is that it is very much more economical for the Government. It has been estimated by those who are better posted than I am as to the statistics and figures that the cash provision would mean a saving of over \$1,000,000,000 to the Government. Some say \$2,000,000,000, but suppose it is only \$1,000,000,000; that is worth considering. It seems to me, upon that ground alone, that the amendment providing for the cash benefits should be adopted.

If we estimate that the total cost of the cash plan would aggregate \$1,500,000,000, we can easily float Government bonds at 4 per cent. The Senator from Georgia said 3½ per cent. We could provide a sinking fund at 1 per cent more, which would be 5 per cent per annum. Five per cent on \$1,500,000,000 would be \$75,000,000 a year; so that the total cost under that arrangement would be \$75,000,000 a year for 20 years. We can easily reduce taxes; it is estimated that we can reduce them this year by at least \$230,000,000 or \$300,000,000. Suppose we paid \$75,000,000 a year and reduced taxes \$300,000,000 a year, we would still be taking care of the adjusted compensation and at the same time reducing the taxes of the people. I am in favor of tax reduction, of course.

There are a large number of ex-service men who disclaim any sort of approval of this proposed legislation; they even denounce it. Of course, the answer to that is that none of them are obliged to avail themselves of any of the benefits of the proposed legislation. If they disapprove of the whole idea, the whole principle, all they will have to do is not to file their applications and for themselves decline any benefits under the bill if it shall become a law.

Mr. President, I was a member of the Committee on Military Affairs in 1914, and from then on, and I am so still. I did my part as best I could toward organizing and bringing into existence the Army upon a proper fighting basis. I favored and urged, so far as I was able, what was known as the draft law. I think now that it was a splendid step; if not an absolutely necessary one, a very wise and proper one, and a plan that was admirably conceived and worked out. If I make a contract with a man, he is at perfect liberty to suggest his terms, and I am at perfect liberty to agree with him about them. If he renders the service and I pay him according to the terms of the contract, I feel that that should be an end to the matter. He has no further claim on me, and I none on him.

We have entered into an agreement; he has performed his part; I have performed my part; and he has no right to come to me and say the contract was a hard one, not a good one, and to ask further consideration in connection with it. When, however, I lay my hand on a man and say, "Whether you like it or do not like it, you have got to serve in this war," as did the Government in this case, it presents a different question. When the Government drafted these men it said to them, "Whether you approve or do not approve, whether you feel that you can afford it or do not feel that you can afford it, you must shoulder your gun and take your chances and fight the battles of your country." In those circumstances I should apply the same rule to the Government that I would to myself, and I should feel that I ought to satisfy the man whom I had forced into the service, had the power to require and did require that he serve, whether with his will or against his will. I drafted him; I did not consult him at all. For instance, I

said, "You can not do as you would like in this matter, but you must do as your Government demands and requires." In those circumstances, I feel conscientiously and morally bound to satisfy that man so far as I can when he comes afterwards and says, "You forced me into this work; I took all the chances."

Of course, the disabled and the crippled and the maimed we must take care of; nobody questions that. It must be done properly and fully, as we are able to do it. This is a great country and is able to do that and also to meet the demands of this measure without practically feeling it at all. When even those who returned safe and sound feel that there is still some consideration due them; that there is some recognition which they ought to have and which they have not had; that there are claims upon the Government which they feel they are entitled to assert, and they come forward and do assert them, and make those claims and call upon the representatives of the Government to do what they consider the fair and square thing, as one individual Senator, I feel that I ought to meet them, so far as it is possible for me to do so, upon a basis that is reasonable and just and fair according to their estimation. They have figured the pending measure out as being the proper thing to be done; they have said, "We shall be satisfied when this is done, but we shall not be satisfied if it is not done." Having obliged them to suffer these losses and to undergo these hazards and hardships, these risks, and these trials I feel that I ought, in these circumstances, to put myself in the position of doing what they feel is the right and proper thing to do.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am going to vote, first, for the provision for a cash compensation, and then later on, unless that provision shall be adopted, I shall vote for the bill without the amendment.

Mr. KEYES. Mr. President, I have no intention of detaining the Senate at this time, for I recognize that this body is apparently ready to act on the bill now before it, and which we all recognize, I think, involves a matter which should be promptly and finally settled.

In the Sixty-seventh Congress, when the bill providing for adjusted compensation for veterans of the World War was under consideration, I felt compelled to oppose the measure for several reasons which I do not think it necessary to mention at this time.

During the consideration of the then pending legislation the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] proposed a substitute for the bill reported from the Committee on Finance which was practically the same as the bill recently passed by the House of Representatives and which is now before us.

Let me say that I then heartily approved the insurance plan suggested at that time and am recorded as having voted in favor of it. To me this plan seemed then and seems now to be a fair and just solution of this long-standing question.

It so happened that I held the office of governor of my State during the years of the World War, and I have never forgotten the assurances, both personal and official, made to the men from my State who went into the service, and I feel gratified to find myself at last in a position to keep faith with these men who so splendidly served their country. So, Mr. President, if the bill remains substantially in the form in which it came from the Committee on Finance, I shall support it.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I understand that a very large majority of my colleagues here are in favor of either one or the other of the two propositions which are now before the Senate. It seems certain the measure in some form, either providing a cash payment or an insurance feature, or both, will pass and ultimately become a law. Knowing that fact, one might well, I presume, refrain from trespassing upon the time of the Senate to express views which are out of harmony with the program, but I have certain opinions in connection with this matter which it seems to me ought to go along with my vote.

Mr. President, economy in public expenditure is perhaps the great unsolved problem of government. I have long thought that it is the most vital question in American politics. I do not regard it as a party matter but rather as a national problem. I repeat it is not a party question. To say that one party is for economy and the other for extravagance is simply to trifle with a great subject in the presence of 110,000,000 distressed and dissatisfied people. But that it is a national problem can hardly be doubted.

Our indebtedness in this country at the present time, State and National, is about \$32,000,000,000, and by the time this Congress shall have adjourned it will be from thirty-five to thirty-six billion dollars, a sum of money which is inconceivable when it is undertaken to be measured, especially in foot pounds of human toil. A Congress which was pledged in every way to the reduction of obligations and to the curtailment of expenditures will adjourn and go back to its constituency after having added from \$3,000,000,000 to \$4,000,000,000 of additional obligations.

We shall pass a tax bill, so it is said, reducing taxes some \$250,000,000 or \$300,000,000, increase our obligations some \$4,000,000,000, and go home to report to our constituencies that we have lightened their burdens.

Thirty-six billion dollars, Mr. President, is a larger indebtedness than any nation in the history of the world having no greater age than this Republic has ever carried. With natural resources illimitable, with vast public lands available until within the last few years, with an energetic, industrious, frugal people, we find that at the end of less than 150 years there has been imposed upon the people of the United States a burden the like of which no people have ever carried in the history of the world, when age is considered. That it is beginning to have its effect in this country upon the morale and standing of the citizenship of this country one can scarcely doubt; and somewhere or at some time we must deny ourselves the privilege of doing that which sentimentally we would like to do, which ordinarily it would be a pleasure to do, in order to adopt another program—a program of relief and of economy to the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. President, let us look at some of these figures and the growth of these burdens during the last few years, and draw what we can in the way of a lesson from our examination. I do not think anyone will be able to dispute the figures which I am going to give; and if it is impossible to dispute the figures, I leave those who hear me and those who may read to refute the logic of my conclusions if they can.

In 1894 our taxation was \$12.50 per capita. In 1922 it was \$64.63 per capita, and in some of the cities \$91.

In 1913 our tax bill, State and Federal, was \$2,194,000,000. Eight years thereafter, and four years after the close of the war, when many of the war expenditures should have been eliminated, it was \$7,061,000,000, and it is about that sum now. In other words, in some eight years, speaking in round numbers, we increased our tax bill from \$2,000,000,000 to \$7,000,000,000.

In 1903 our taxes per capita were \$17.03. In 1922 they were \$64.63.

In 1913 we were taking 6.4 per cent of our national income in the way of taxes. In 1922 we were taking 12.1 per cent of the national income for taxes.

Mr. President, our tax bill for either 1922 or 1923 was larger than the entire running expenses of the Government for the 20 years from 1873 to 1893.

Let us now select a particular class in order that we may see in another way how the taxes have increased.

The farmers' tax bill in 1913 was \$624,000,000. In 1922, eight years thereafter, it was \$1,436,000,000, an increase upon the farmers of the country in eight years of a billion dollars in the way of a tax bill.

Measured by the ratio of income, the farmers' taxes in 1913 were 10.16 per cent on return of income, as compared with 4.1 per cent of the remainder of the community.

In 1922 the ratio for the farmer was 16.6 per cent, leaving the balance of the community at a ratio of 11 per cent.

Taxes on farm lands in 1922 were 126 per cent higher than in 1914. In other words, where a farmer paid \$100 taxes in 1914, in 1922 he paid \$226 taxes.

I clipped from a newspaper the other day an item with reference to a great wheat-raising county in one of the great wheat-raising States of the Union in the far Northwest. The taxes of that county for this year were \$259,886, while the wheat crop sold for \$225,000. The taxes of the county were some \$35,000 more than the entire value of the wheat crop.

Mr. President, as I said a moment ago, the effect of these taxes upon the morale of our citizenship is deeper and more widespread than we ordinarily are willing here to admit. Some days ago the Agricultural Department put out a statement with reference to the condition of the farming interests in 15 of the great Northwestern States. Let us look at it for a moment.

More than 8½ per cent of those owning farms in the 15 corn and wheat producing States lost their farms without legal process between 1920 and 1923. More than 8½ per cent of those who had accepted the agricultural life as their vocation, and in all probability had devoted the better part of their lives to building up their farms, lost their homes in two years. More than 15 per cent of the owners were in fact temporarily insolvent, but held out through the leniency of creditors. Add that to the 8½ per cent, and you have 23½ per cent of the farmers of these great Northwestern States who are on the very verge of bankruptcy, some of them having passed over it.

Out of 69,000 farmers who owned their farms in these 15 States, 2,800 lost their farms through foreclosure and tax sales; 3,000 lost their farms without legal process; 10,400 farmers held on through the leniency of creditors.

Of 26,000 farmers in the areas covered, 1,900, or more than 7 per cent, lost their property through formal proceedings; 2,000, or more than 7 per cent, went under without legal formality; and 5,500, or 21 per cent, were spared through the leniency of creditors.

Out of a total of 2,289,000 owners and tenant farmers more than 108,000 lost their farms through foreclosure or tax sale; over 122,000 lost their property without legal proceedings; and 378,000 retained their property only through the leniency of creditors.

Of course I realize, Mr. President, that other things than taxes alone enter into this condition of affairs; but when we go into these great agricultural communities and pick up the county paper and see page after page covered with items of tax sales of agricultural land, we are advised as to the predominating effect of these increased taxes toward bankrupting these agriculturists.

Doctor Ely has made a statement upon this subject. In a statement printed some time ago he said:

While the farmers' land in the 40-year period increased in value in Ohio from an average of \$45.97 in 1880 to \$113.17 in 1920, the tax per acre increased in the 8-year period, 1913-1921, alone from 65 cents to \$1.15. * * * The percentage of increase in the very short period in Ohio is 177 and in Kansas 271.

In 1850, according to the most accurate estimate, the rent of land in the United States exceeded taxes, local, State, and National by somewhat more than \$70,000,000. From 1890 to 1915 the increases are closely parallel. After 1915 to 1920, while there is a slight increase in the annual land values or rent of land, the cost of government increases from \$4,300,000,000 in 1915 to \$19,000,000,000 plus in 1919, and then drops to \$9,600,000,000 plus in 1920. In 1920 the taxes exceeded the rent by over \$4,000,000.

In other words, the taxes in these States upon the lands covered by this survey exceed the income by more than \$4,000,000.

Figures ordinarily, Mr. President, are dull and tedious things; they tell us little of the forces which move multitudes or change the current of events. But these figures sound the whole gamut of human passions and plumb the very depth of human misery and despair. Homes abandoned, families separated, and the plans of a lifetime shattered, and shattered after it is too late to form others. Nothing could be of greater moment, nothing of deeper significance. Men will fail in every calling and homes will be sacrificed and plans will be broken because of incapacity or improvidence. This is to be expected, and becomes a commonplace in the struggle for success. But that is not the situation which these figures so vividly reveal. To regard it as such is to close our eyes to as serious a problem as can confront legislators. These figures tell a different story, they present a wholly different problem; they tell the story of industry robbed of its reward, of frugality stripped of its compensation, of men and women, patient, persistent, and capable, deprived of their savings and separated from their property through a wasteful and cruel exaction in the name of government, an exaction, sir, which results not only in ruin to the individuals but, if long continued, ruin to the community and to the State. These figures tell us not of the few, the incidental failures of life; they tell us of the many, of the tendency in communities, of the trend of the times; they tell us of a disease which is rotting away the moral fiber of great Commonwealths and undermining the manhood and womanhood of a citizenship upon which alone our institutions may rest. In these conditions is revealed a national problem in the solution of which enters our whole future as a people and as a Government.

I would rather read of the loss of a battle than to read the facts and figures I have just given you showing the conditions in those 15 great States. What it means to the individual farmer and his family, the demoralizing and deadening effect upon the persons immediately involved, is serious enough; that alone ought to justify the most vigilant effort to remedy conditions. But viewed in the light of the public's interest of national health and prestige, that begira from the farm to the city, from the field to the crowded room on the alley, is a menace we can not ignore and dare not belittle.

If this is not a national problem, there can be no national problem. We are so situated geographically, so circumstanced, so endowed with natural wealth as to be able to defy those scourges and visitations which the incidents in nature and the accidents of politics bring even to the most advanced and enlightened peoples. But we can no more withstand the enervating and corroding effect of waste and public prodigality upon the character and fortunes of our citizens than other peoples whose history is now a closed book.

I have seen some efforts of late designed apparently to minimize the evil of tax burdens, telling us how great we are, and how rich we are as a nation, and that these complaints of which we hear are from people never satisfied, who would be complaining of something else if there were no taxes. I do not subscribe to the doctrine so generally put out as a defense to dereliction in public service that people will complain regardless of whether they have been ill or well treated. On the other hand, it is an assuring fact, revealed both by history and observation, that the people pursue uncomplainingly their daily avocations until overtaken by that form of injustice, economic or political, which puts in jeopardy their rights as citizens or challenges their security as a people. Upon this question of Government expenditures, city, State, and Federal, the time has long since passed when the taxpayer should remain silent. Resentment is not only due but belated.

The private citizen should not, under the plea of loyalty to the Government, be silenced upon matters which involve his physical and moral well-being, to say nothing of the institutions under which he lives. Neither is patriotism a virtue which sleeps until aroused by a foreign foe. We do not always pay the tribute to civic vigilance and courage that we do to martial prowess, but it is just as essential to good government and to the maintenance of national power. If any criticism is due to the people, it is not that they have complained or that they are now aroused, but that they have been patient too long. They have had debts piled upon them and taxes imposed, they have been made to carry unnecessary officials and unnecessary employees, they have worked and worried and borrowed and paid taxes until good citizenship and efficient government are involved, and in my opinion no rebuke which they may register can be too severe. The complaints of an industrious and naturally loyal people, Mr. President, are an infallible index to unwise and unjust laws or inadequate and incompetent administration.

I recognize, of course, that much of this burden of which I am speaking comes from local taxes. We here, of course, can not deal with that problem, we can not lift that weight. But an economical Government at Washington, an example here at the Nation's Capital, will give much direct relief and indirectly the effect would be of tremendous benefit to all. The authorities in the States point to the waste at Washington and tell the taxpayers there is the source of their ills. The authorities at Washington say to the voters: It is your city and State which weigh you down. This is the diaphanous plea of men who know of the wrong to the taxpayer and shrink from putting forth the effort to remedy it. The fact is the blame is both double and single and can be lifted only by double and single efforts. But the lead in the crusade for economy should come from Washington. It is up to those in power here to establish a new standard in public expenditures. Anything which brings economic health to the country as a whole will help the farmer and the small business man and every honest toiler in the land. Anything which encourages new enterprises, invites capital into lines of building and development, will help the business man, the plantation owner, and the rancher alike.

In these days there are countless remedies being proposed to help the farmer, but give him a market for that which his indefatigable industry produces and the farmer will neither ask for nor accept the remedies born of political fright. And the way to build his market is to unchain the latent energies which taxes have greatly sterilized and unleash the initiative which shameless waste has all but destroyed. Let us not confuse the issue by pointing to the extravagance of cities and States. It will be time enough to denounce them after we have done our full duty here. What we need is a beginning, a manifestation of invincible purpose, something which in the estimation of the people will lift the Government at Washington out of this eternal circle of appropriations and taxes, around which we are lashed in monotonous mediocrity year after year. The duty rests upon us here to curtail expenditures wherever we can do so, even if we have to do so by failing to do some things which, as I said a few moments ago, personally and sentimentally might be a most pleasurable thing to do. Unless we make up our minds, as a people, not only as a Senate and as a House of Representatives, but as a people, that we shall deny ourselves, and that we shall cut, regardless of personal consequences, there is no hope for the alleviation of this condition.

Burdensome taxes reach the citizen from almost every conceivable source. One of the most vital questions of this country is the exorbitant freight rates. With us, living in the portion of the country which is known as the Far West, it is one of the most important questions touching our economic life, and the question of taxes is a very great item in these constantly

increasing freight rates. In 1892 railroad taxes were \$209 per mile; in 1902, were \$277; in 1912, \$485 a mile; in 1922, an average of \$1,241 a mile. Another statistician has placed it in this way: In 1911, railroads paid in taxes \$98,626,848; in 1922, they paid \$301,034,923, an increase of 205 per cent. You can not lay these burdensome and crushing taxes without affecting the citizenship of the country in every walk of life. One of the most fatuous and demagogic policies that was ever advocated is the idea that you can put heavy taxes upon a certain class and not affect anybody outside of that class.

I know, of course, that there is scarcely a proposition which comes before this body with reference to the appropriation of money which has not behind it a laudable and most commendable sentiment or purpose. You could find sufficient reason for taking every dollar out of the Treasury of the United States and not violate any of the Ten Commandments; but we can not conduct governmental affairs on that basis. This money is not ours. We are trustees for a season, and we ought to bear in mind we are dealing with other people's money.

Of course, I realize that it is perhaps too much to expect that either one of the great political parties, under the exigencies which exist at this time, would be willing to place itself in a position before the country of refusing the demands of those who served their country. Individuals may be willing to do so, but political organizations which control government, acting en masse and from the influence of mass power, are not to be expected, I presume, as parties or as those who are in power, to assume that attitude. It ought to be otherwise, but it is not otherwise. But I am not sure that even as a matter of expediency, as a matter of mere politics, we are upon very safe ground. Let us consider the question a moment.

Mr. President, I perfectly understand and greatly appreciate the value of political parties. There is nothing to take their place in a Government like ours. I quarrel with no man because of his party zeal. Partisanship may be close to patriotism, and sometimes they are one and the same thing. The old Democratic Party, led by Jefferson, with its platform of principles and its inspiring policies, arousing the faith and commanding the devotion of its adherents, was commensurate in aims and purposes with the aims and ambitions of the Republic itself. The party of Lincoln, born of a great moral revolution, with its platform of freedom for all, and led by men of uncommon power, was synonymous with union; it stood not only for a new dispensation of liberty but for a Nation disenthralled and reunited. Parties measured by these standards stand next to our laws and our institutions, and any man may well take pride in being a part of such a political organization. To serve them is, in a large measure, to serve your country.

But, my friends, while we may here be reluctant to admit it, the people feel, and feel with disquietude, that we have fallen on different days. Party lines are shadowy and uncertain. The voters are distrustful. Party appeals excite no enthusiasm. And yet there never was a time in the history of our country when there was such dire need of great political organizations or when the people were more deeply and profoundly interested in public questions, or more eager for information touching political problems. The underlying, fundamental vice of American politics at this time consists in playing the game on too low a standard—far below the level of both the intelligence and patriotism of the voter. The great majority of the people swing backwards and forwards between the parties, giving tremendous majorities one year and the opposite the next, in the vain hope of finding a way out of their present dissatisfied and distressing conditions. Give the people issues and a program and the splendid days of the past in party politics will return. The weakness of our present position, I repeat, is that we underestimate the sincerity, the capacity, and the willingness of the voters to do great things and make great sacrifices for their country. A Democrat in the days of Jackson was a crusader. It can be so again. A Republican in the days of Lincoln was an apostle. It can be so again.

History may not repeat itself, but there are pages from which we can pick both a warning and a lesson. In 1852 both the Whigs and the Democrats met at Baltimore. Both declared in effect for the Missouri compromise. Both treated the slavery question as forever settled. The Whigs and the Democrats were about as near alike on the slavery question as the Republicans and Democrats now are on appropriations and the waste of public money. Both parties in those days seemed to be under the impression that by simple decree in the party platform they could settle a great moral question before it was solved and that they could satisfy the demands of millions of sincere men and women for an unfortunate race. Stephen A. Douglas went home declaring that he never expected to make another speech

on slavery. As a matter of fact he wore his life out making just that kind of speeches. But while the leaders resolved and declared, the people reflected and were dissatisfied. The great problem would not down. It was unsettled and every voter North and South knew it.

One day there appeared in the political arena a strange figure from the prairies of Illinois, the true child of democracy. He raised the politics of his day to a level with the brain and the conscience of the average citizen. He spoke as one having authority. He was what men would now sometimes call an idealist, because he believed in doing the right thing regardless of consequences. One by one the dexterous devotees of political expediency either disappeared or lost their identity among the hosts who arrayed themselves behind the new leader. The old Whig Party died of sheer political cowardice. The Democratic Party shortly thereafter went into retirement, bankrupt both in morals and courage. The men who have raised politics to the highest level in morals and in intelligence have been our greatest party leaders. The people have followed them. The fault at this time is not with the people.

It is true slavery was a great moral problem. It was also a great economic problem. When great economic and moral questions combine, become one, they have a way of sweeping into the dust heap of history those who disregard them or break in pieces political parties and individuals who challenge their onward sweep toward adjustment. Public expenditures, and thereby the inevitable increase of taxes, is no longer merely an economic question, no longer nothing more than extracting from the pockets of the people an increased sum of money, it has already reached the point where it may, and must be, regarded as a great moral question. It involves not only the material welfare but the moral stamina of our citizens. These increased burdens mean imperiled and forfeited homes, mean less educational advantages for the coming citizen, mean separated and demoralized families, they mean energy thwarted and enterprise sterilized, and, last of all, they mean thriftlessness and improvidence and moral breakdown of a great and proud people. We have reached the point where danger signals are out. Men and women are beginning to feel a deep sense of wrong. Faith in the Government is giving way.

And whose record is this which we read in the budgets of cities, States, and the Nation? Whose record is this which tells of increased tax burdens all the way from 300 per cent to 500 per cent in the last 15 years? It is the record of the two parties which have divided power for 50 years in this country. You can not in the study of the census report, the rise of expenditures, as shown by those records, tell me which party was in power in any particular city or State or which party was in power during any particular period in the Nation. In that accusatory record there are no party lines. And what is either, or both parties, proposing to do about it? What is the relief? Here in the Congress both parties vie with each other and vote heavier and still heavier obligations. Take warning from the gatherings at Baltimore in 1852. The people of this country will not give up their homes or deny their children schooling or suffer indefinitely the rigors of economic peonage for the sake of party; they will some day, and in my opinion at no distant day, turn upon their torturers. So far as I am concerned, I am in that frame of mind, sir, that I welcome relief from whatever source. If it is not to come through the party of which I am a member, still I shall rejoice at its coming. I want the relief. I know it has got to come. How many parties will be wrecked or how many will go homeless before it comes I do not know, but certainly relief must come. The men who will stop the waste from the Public Treasury, who will call for and secure a return to the simple and sound principles of public economy, it is not too much to say, will be the second founders of this Republic.

We are now passing through a season of humiliation. It ought also to be a season of contrition and repentance. For days and weeks and months there has been going out from this Capital the revolting, nauseating story of carelessness, of incompetency, of venality, of the low, sordid practices and conceptions of public duty. Among all the seats of governmental power in the world to-day, the beautiful city on the Potomac bearing the sacred name of the father of our country, and made dear to 110,000,000 people through the historic triumphs of exalted public service—among them all, Washington at this hour stands out in the news columns conspicuous, isolated, solitary, corrupt, and contented. Here where Washington planned and built; where Jefferson strove for a wider and more universal democracy; where Lincoln for more than four long years trod the wine press in solitude and sorrow; and where at last he gave up his life for the country he loved—here speculation and corruption have dared to come, and in their insolence presume to direct public affairs. This situa-

tion calls for something more than the canceling of a few illegal contracts or the punishment of a few individual betrayers of public interest. The evil has its roots deeper down in the social and political strata. It calls for more than a change of administrations. It is only a more virulent outbreak of a disease that affects the whole body politic. Extravagance is only one step on the hither side of corruption. They are both plants from the same putrid soil and flourish in the same infected atmosphere. Both in the end dissipate public property, exploit and impoverish the citizens, and undermine and destroy free government. It makes little difference in the last analysis to the taxpayer whether his property and his interests are dissipated and destroyed through individual corruptionists or through an unconscionable disregard of sound laws which protect his rights and guarantee his success as a citizen.

And who is more interested in renovating and remedying this situation, in arresting the trend of affairs than the same young men whose interests we are now considering? It is peculiarly their fight, and these precedents which we are now establishing they will have to uproot, the obligations we are imposing they will have to meet, these evils and the ensuing burdens they will have to face. These young men and their families will advantage but little by the proposal before us. Their prosperity and their success must be won in the future and that prosperity and that success will be gauged according to the general conditions and environments and according to the kind of public policies amidst which and under which they must contend. Who is more interested in staying the increase of taxes, in clean and economic government, in avoiding the mortgaging of the coming days, and upon whom will fall most heavily the whole program than those who are now just taking up the wider and deeper concerns of life? I venture to say to these soldiers that they will learn as others have learned, sometimes to their sorrow, sometimes to their joy, that the most vital rule in the battle for supremacy, whether as an individual or as a state, is putting aside the temporary advantage for the permanent, the short aim for the long.

I would like, in all candor, to ask these young men to look back over the last 30 years—brief, fleeting years—a fugitive shadow upon the dial when considered as a mere matter of time, but a century when measured by their effect upon our Government. The bonds piled up, the bureaus built up, the offices created, the constant mounting of the tax burden, the spread and waste of prodigality; let them review this record with care and reflection. Then, assuming that this fateful tendency is to continue—and there is every evidence that it is to continue—protrude themselves into the future for 30 years.

There will be an officer for every 10 persons in the Republic. Every conceivable activity of mind and body will be under the direction and surveillance of a bureau. Inspectors and spies will leer upon the citizen from every street and corner and accompany him hourly in his daily avocation. Taxes will be a hundred dollars per capita. Forty per cent of the national income will be demanded for public expenses. We will still have a Republic in name but a bureaucracy in fact—the most wasteful, the most extravagant, the most demoralizing and deadly form of government which God in His inscrutable wisdom has ever permitted to torture the human family. This is not the picture of a disturbed imagination; it is the remorseless logic of the present drift of things. All you need to do is to take up the last 30 years and lay them down upon the next 30 and you have it all as I have indicated. It seems to me time to take stock. The rarest as well as the most profound incident in free government is when "a great people turn a calm and scrutinizing eye upon itself." And it is time that we brace ourselves for that ordeal. The influences against which sound principles of government have to contend come to us unannounced or in friendly guise.

"The stroke of the clock tells of the change from hour to hour," the sunset tells of the departing day, the season change advises us of the fleeting months, but no stroke, no warning tells us of these silent but fateful changes in a nation's life, these subtle transformations in government upon which turn a people's destiny. These changes must be searched for among the customs and habits and tendencies of a whole people and can only be stayed or turned aside through the high resolves and self-denial of an entire nation. I repeat, the time has come to take stock. "It is a vain hope that by cheerfully ignoring danger we shall avoid it."

This morning before a committee of the Senate we were considering an appropriation of \$11,000,000 to feed the hungry children of a foreign land. Every instinct of humanity pleads their cause. While we sat considering this proposal there came an amendment to appropriate for the hungry of three other

nations. We adjourned the committee meeting and hastened here to this Chamber to consider the voting of a \$3,000,000,000 obligation upon the taxpayers of this country. Is the taxpayer to have no consideration? Is he presumed to be without limit as to funds? Who is to pay all these bills? One may well exclaim, "Watchman, what of the night!" We sit here and flatter our humanitarianism and augment in our own eyes at least our patriotism by voting away millions of the taxpayers' money and obligating him beyond all capacity to pay. But what about the harassed citizen? What about the man who must find the means to pay the bills? I venture to say in all sincerity that these very young men whose interests we are now considering are far more interested in changing this ruinous course than either myself or any Member who sits in this Chamber. The future is theirs, and it is the future that we are presuming to mortgage. It is that future with which we are trifling.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I am sure that we have all been very greatly impressed with the attractive and eloquent speech of the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]. I can quite understand that he is the spokesman of a very considerable element of the people of the country. From his premise his logic leads to the irresistible conclusions which he has just announced. The defect, however, in his very able presentation goes to the very basis of the proposition which the Senate is now considering. His argument, his illustrations, and even his express language designates the present measure as a bonus bill. I can quite understand how anyone looking upon the measure as a mere gratuity, as a bonus, would be opposed to it.

The Senator from Idaho has expressed himself to-day in a manner consistent with his previous position upon this great subject. He looks upon the measure as a bonus, a gratuity, and from that standpoint I quite agree with him. If we are to concede the premise, his conclusion is irresistible. He has pictured to us how we would corrupt the good citizenship of the men mentioned in this measure, whom we are attempting to serve. If this were a mere gratuity, if I believed that premise, I should certainly agree with the conclusions reached by the Senator from Idaho; but I do not accept the basis of his argument. I do not believe that is a gratuity. Certainly many of us, at least I for one, look upon it from an entirely different viewpoint. I believe that this is a debt which is due to these men, and I do not believe the young men of this country will be corrupted when this great Nation of ours undertakes to pay its debt. So I do not believe that the evil effects which the Senator from Idaho has pictured in such eloquent language are at all consequent upon the act which we are proposing here in this Chamber.

We need only recall, Mr. President, the circumstances under which these men entered into the service of the Government in order to reach the conclusion that we not only owe them this compensation, but that from every moral point of view, from every standpoint of equity and justice, it is just as much a debt of this Government as are the bonds which were purchased by the people who were able to purchase them in this country and to whom we are annually paying to-day about \$1,000,000,000 in interest.

The Great War which we participated in was fought out by this Nation in a manner somewhat different from that which had ever prevailed in this country in the history of any previous war. We concluded that we would bring into the service of the Nation a large number of men; in fact, all of the men whose age would permit them to serve in the ranks of the Army. We adopted what was called the draft law, the selective-service program. Under that legislation there were enrolled something more than 24,000,000 men. All of that great number were thus by law made subject to the call of their country. It so happened that only about four and a half million of them were needed. The other 20,000,000, who were subject to the call, who had been recorded, and whose names and residences and occupations were known, were not called. They were permitted to go into the ordinary walks of life; they were permitted to wear civilian clothing; they were permitted to get the pay of civilians. In that great time of activity they received wages which they had never before received; but these four and one-half million men were taken by this great Government of ours without a question as to whether or not they desired to enter into this great program, and they were put into the ranks; they wore the uniform of their country, and not at a rate of pay to which they had agreed but for the meager sum of \$1 a day, which the law of the country said that they should have and no more. Even out of that pittance they were expected to contribute about one-half for insurance against the eventualities of war for the protection of their

dependents, and in order to reduce the number of dependents which should thereafter be supported by this Government.

In addition to that, they had to send back a portion of their pay to support their dependents, and were permitted to retain only a very meager sum for their ordinary expenses.

In those circumstances, when this Government took those men, when the Government fixed the pay, and when it fixed it at less than others who were subject to the same order received, it seems to me that in passing legislation of this sort we are not conferring upon them a bonus, a gratuity, but that we are merely paying an honest, a solemn, and a just debt. Viewing the subject from that standpoint—and I believe, Mr. President, that that is the view of the vast majority of the people of America—I am confident no evil effect can come from this proposed legislation.

Mr. President, I think it worth while that we should make a brief note of the sentiment of the country as expressed by the representatives of the people in the two Houses of Congress. This question has been pending before Congress for a long time. On May 29, 1920—almost four years ago—the House of Representatives by a vote of 289 to 92 passed what was known as the adjusted compensation bill. That bill provided for various options, among them being a payment in cash. It also contained a provision for education, a provision for obtaining homes, and other options. The bill came over to the Senate soon after its passage in the other House. For some reason, which I have never been able to learn, the bill was not finally reported to the Senate until in February, 1921, only a few days before that Congress was to adjourn.

It is true that the Republican Party controlled both the House of Representatives and the Senate at that time, but there was a Democratic President. It was stated, at least around the cloakrooms, that the purpose of deferring the consideration of that bill after its passage by the House in 1920 was to allow it to go over until after the change in the political complexion of the Chief Executive of the Nation. At any rate, it did go over. It came to the Senate too late for consideration at that Congress.

The bill was considered during the summer of 1921, being reported to the Senate on the 25th of June, 1921, and finally reaching the stage of consideration. After the Senate had discussed it for a day or two it was quite apparent that if a vote were had it would pass this body by an overwhelming majority. Then it was that the President of the United States came into the Chamber and requested that the bill be recommitted. It was recommitted on July 15, 1921, by a vote of 47 to 29.

However, the measure would not down. In 1922 the House of Representatives took up the question again and on the 16th of March, 1922, reported to the House another bill containing very much the same provisions as the bill which had previously been reported to the Senate. The bill passed the House by a vote of 373 to 70 on March 23, 1922. It was reported to the Senate on the 8th of June, 1922. It passed the Senate by a vote of 36 to 17 on September 15, 1922. It was vetoed by the President in a message of September 20, 1922. It went back to the House, where the House passed it over the veto of the President by a vote of 258 to 54 on September 20, 1922. It then came to the Senate, but failed to pass the Senate over the President's veto, although there voted for such passage over the veto 44 Senators, as against 28 opposed to it. Then, during this year on the 18th of March this bill, practically as it is now reported to the Senate by the Finance Committee, passed the House by a vote of 355 to 54, and is now before the Senate.

Of course it will be observed that there is a vast difference between this bill as reported to the Senate and the previous bills. This bill is only an endowment insurance bill, except as to those who would be entitled to receive \$50 or less. To my mind, if this bill should be adopted as reported by the Finance Committee it would be the consummation of a legislative tragedy; not only that, but it would be the consummation, in my humble judgment, of the spirit of insidious avarice which has surrounded this measure from the time it was introduced in Congress until the present hour. We have only to look back over its history to realize the subtle and insidious methods which have been employed before Congress and the country for the purpose of defeating the payment of this honest debt from this great Government of ours to those who served it in its hour of need.

Mr. President, what has been the opposition to this adjusted-compensation legislation? From whence has come the argument, the continuous propaganda, against this legislation? The finger must point to the one great central source, to him high in the official life of this Government, the Secretary of the Treasury of

the United States. It was he who undertook to lay the foundation for the defeat of this most beneficent legislation. We go back to the first time when the House of Representatives was considering the legislation, in the spring of 1921, and there we find the finger marks of the Secretary of the Treasury; and it will not suffice to pass by what is apparent to all of us here and to the understanding of the people of this country—the spirit which presses forward and which enters into the various activities, recommendations, and even the laws of economics of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FERNALD in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I yield just for a question.

Mr. KING. The Senator has suggested that the head of the opposition to the bonus was the Secretary of the Treasury. If the Senator will pardon me, a number of years ago the Legion itself and many of the posts throughout the States announced their opposition to the bonus, and the overwhelming majority of the soldiers and sailors of the World War were then outspoken in their opposition; but, if I may be pardoned, some Senators and some Congressmen and some persons who were seeking political preferment throughout the United States injected this question into the political arena, and in my humble opinion they are largely responsible for the propaganda in favor of the bonus, and by their efforts they have magnified the matter and induced many of the soldiers to become proponents of the measure.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I have not yet had time to develop the thought which I had in mind. I agree that a large number of very able, honest, thorough American citizens have opposed the so-called bonus, and they are entitled to their view; but those people, I am sure, including the distinguished Senator from Utah, do not consider this measure as providing adjusted compensation. It is looked upon as a mere gratuity. I have reference now to those who have not raised that great argument but who have yet undertaken to oppose this measure; and of all those who have presented the poverty of the country as the excuse for opposition it has centered itself in the Secretary of the Treasury—a man who, I understand, is perhaps quite as well able, if not more able, to bear some of the burdens of the Government than any other individual citizen.

What do we find? On April 30, 1921, in a letter addressed to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, we find this statement from him, the controller of the finances of this Nation, the one who assumes to recommend what appropriations shall be made, what revenue laws shall be passed, and even what their provisions shall be. Thus early after his incumbency of that great office, which occurred on the 4th of March preceding, on the 30th day of April we find this most remarkable letter—remarkable in the light of the actuality which has developed since that date.

He says:

The estimates of receipts and expenditures for both 1921 and 1922 show clearly that while this Government has definitely balanced its Budget, the surplus of current receipts over current expenditures will not quite provide for what may be termed the fixed public-debt redemptions, and that unless expenditures are sharply reduced there will be practically no funds available in these years for the retirement of the floating debt represented by loan and tax certificates outstanding. The estimated current surplus in both 1921 and 1922 will be absorbed (1) by current redemptions of war-saving securities, redeemable substantially on demand, (2) by purchases for the cumulative sinking fund, (3) by acceptance of Liberty bonds and Victory notes for estate taxes, and (4) by miscellaneous other debt retirements which must be made each year in order to comply with existing law or with the terms of outstanding securities.

That was his doleful statement on April 30, 1921. That statement was reiterated by the Secretary of the Treasury on July 2, 1921, when he wrote to a Member of this body, Mr. Frelinghuysen, a reiteration and a reaffirmance of his statements made in the letter which I have just read. The Secretary stated:

I have already submitted to Congress, in my letter of April 30 to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, a detailed statement of the condition of the Treasury, the latest estimates of the receipts and expenditures of the Government for the fiscal years 1921 and 1922, and an outline of the Treasury's program for dealing with the short-dated debt. The figures given in that letter show that even without any expenditures on account of adjusted compensation under

the proposed bill there is grave danger that the necessary expenditures of the Government in the near future will exceed its current receipts, thus leaving deficits to be met by new taxes or further borrowings.

That was on the 2d of July; and it was undoubtedly the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury which caused President Harding to come before this body and ask that the adjusted compensation bill be recommitted. Unquestionably he was advised from that source; and so we find the then President making this remark in his notable speech to this body.

He says:

I would be remiss in my duty if I failed to ask Congress to pause at this particular time rather than break down our Treasury, from which so much is later on to be expected.

Mr. President, that was the doleful picture which the Secretary of the Treasury brought to the Congress and which he undoubtedly inspired the President of the United States to reaffirm and to sponsor. I think it advisable at this time, however, to indulge in some statements as to what actually occurred, and to the prospects as they appeared at that time.

Mark you, this letter from the Secretary of the Treasury was dated April 30, 1921, only two months before the end of the fiscal year 1921. The letter affirming his previous statement was addressed to Senator Frelinghuysen on the 2d of July, 1921, two days after the expiration of the fiscal year 1921. The President's remarks were made on the 12th of July, 12 days after the end of the fiscal year; and if the Secretary of the Treasury knew what was going on in his office, I submit that his statements were absolutely unjustified.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, what were the facts?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The facts are these: It will be recalled that the great depression began in this country along the latter part of 1920.

Mr. OWEN. Does the Senator refer to the manufactured depression?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The manufactured depression, through the deflation policy and other policies following; but here is what actually occurred:

On the 30th of June, 1920, the gross debt of the United States was \$24,299,000,000. The cash in the Treasury was \$357,000,000. I am leaving out the thousands and hundreds of dollars. On the 30th of June, 1921, that gross debt was reduced, after applying the net balance, to \$23,443,000,000—a net reduction of the debt during the fiscal year 1921 of \$498,000,000. That, however, is not the whole story. During the fiscal year of 1921 this Government paid out in unusual expenses, in capital investments and to settle its indebtedness to the railroads, \$930,000,000, and it received from capital investments \$402,000,000, making excess capital and special expenditures of \$527,000,000. If we add these two together—the amount of reduction of the public debt and the amount of the unusual expenses—we find that the total debt reduction and the capital expenditure during the fiscal year was \$1,025,000,000.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. OWEN. In other words, as I understand, if the redemption of the public debt were postponed for two years, it would settle this adjusted compensation?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The Senator is quite accurate in his estimate, as I shall undertake to show a little later.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate and the Senator to the fact that we extended accommodation to the British taxpayers by permitting them to take approximately 60 years in the settlement of their war debt to the United States. With an amortization plan we could do the same thing with this adjusted compensation, and practically relieve the country of the undue taxation going on now, as well as pay the adjusted compensation.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I believe the Senator is quite accurate and a little later on I will speak in support of the statement which he has made.

So much for the fiscal year 1921. I think we might well analyze to some extent the situation in 1922. It will be recalled that the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury to Senator Frelinghuysen, and the President's speech, all included in their references the fiscal year 1922.

In addition to that, on November 28, 1921, the Secretary of the Treasury again referred to that letter of April 30, 1921, and presented a new estimate of what the situation of the Treasury would be for the fiscal year 1922, and that estimate was that there would be a deficit of \$24,468,000.

On April 14, 1922, in another letter from the Secretary of the Treasury to the chairman of the Finance Committee [Mr. McCumber], he estimated the excess of receipts at only \$47,000,000, whereas the actual excess of receipts for that fiscal year, ending June 30, 1922, was \$318,802,000.

In his annual report for 1922, which was dated in the fall of the calendar year 1922, and during the fiscal year 1923, the Secretary of the Treasury said that in the fiscal year 1922 the indebtedness of the country had been reduced by a billion twenty-six million dollars, and after reducing the debt to that extent \$272,000,000 was left in the Treasury.

As to the fiscal year 1923, which ended on the 30th of June last, in the annual estimate of December 5, 1921, there was an estimated deficit of \$167,000,000. In the letter to Mr. McCumber dated April 14, 1922, there was an excess of expenditures, or a deficit, anticipated of \$359,000,000, but there was an actual excess of receipts of \$309,000,000, making a combined error in that estimate of \$769,000,000.

On July 11, 1922, it was estimated that for the fiscal year 1922 there would be a deficit of \$822,000,000. The President vetoed the adjusted compensation bill on September 20, 1922, something more than two months after the estimate of July 11. The President then said that the deficit for that fiscal year would be more than \$650,000,000.

There was another estimate made. On December 5, 1922, the estimated deficit was \$274,000,000. January 29, 1923, the estimated deficit was \$93,000,000. April 1, 1923, there was an estimated deficit of \$180,000,000. May 1, 1923, there was an estimated surplus of \$62,000,000. Treasury estimate, May 7, 1923, showed an estimated surplus of \$150,000,000. June 18, 1923, there was another estimated surplus of \$200,000,000, and only 12 days later the actual surplus was \$310,000,000.

Just a few days ago it was stated by an official even of the present administration that there had been a juggling of the figures in the Treasury Department. It is somewhat difficult to conceive of an adequate definition of the word "juggle," but if I have any conception of it, it does seem to me that the statement made by that official, one of the ex-service men of the country, was absolutely justified when applied to these various and inconsistent estimates. Why should there have been these differences? Why was it that when the President was about to veto the adjusted compensation bill an estimate should have been made which indicated the largest deficit that had ever been estimated by anybody, and instead of the deficit of \$822,000,000, estimated at the beginning of the fiscal year, there was an actual surplus for the year of \$310,000,000, an error, if you might dignify it by such a term, of \$1,130,000,000.

Not only that, but during the calendar year 1923 there was a further reduction of a vast share of the present indebtedness of the country. That total reduction was \$1,078,785,896.79, according to the figures furnished me by the Treasury Department on yesterday. That is the astounding fact; and I should like to know how the Secretary of the Treasury can reconcile his estimates and the actual facts as they have developed from the very day that he made his first error until this good hour.

Speaking in round numbers, the indebtedness of this Government, which reached the peak August 31, 1919, has been reduced by about \$5,000,000,000. Under the previous administration there was a reduction of about half that sum, and the reduction of the other half, about two and a half billion dollars, has occurred under this administration, notwithstanding these very pessimistic and doleful statements coming from the Secretary of the Treasury.

What does this mean as applied to this bill, and especially applied to the bill if we were to provide for a payment in cash?

Mr. OVERMAN. Will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moses in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. OVERMAN. In referring to the reduction in expenditures, the Senator means only those things growing out of the war, I suppose?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The reduction in expenditures, of course, came largely and almost entirely from the vast reductions which were made subsequent to the war, in matters which were raised up by reason of the war activities.

Mr. OVERMAN. I wanted the Senator to make that clear.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I hope some day to have the opportunity to present just that question to the Senate, in connection with a remark of the Secretary of the Treasury and statements of some others who have pointed out the vast reductions in appropriations in their claims for economy in government.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator is on the Committee on Appropriations, and he remembers a statement I had put into the Record, showing that instead of expenditures, in running the departments here in Washington, decreasing they had increased.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. That itself furnishes a very fertile field for investigation, because only just recently the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House prepared a statement for the press of the country attributing all of the reduction of taxation to the economy measures which the administration has taken, a statement, however, which I believe will be considerably discounted before it is accepted by the masses of the people of the country.

As I said, last year, the calendar year 1923, there was a reduction of the public debt of more than \$1,078,000,000. It is estimated that if this entire compensation to the ex-service men should be paid in cash, it would not require more than a billion and a half dollars. It is estimated by some that if the optional plan were to be adopted, not more than one-half of the ex-service men would exercise the option to take cash. If that were so, the excess return of the public debt of this country for the last calendar year would have more than paid the entire cash bill. Seven hundred and fifty million dollars deducted from \$1,078,000,000 would leave more than \$300,000,000 with which to retire an adequate portion of the public debt. So, in these circumstances, I wonder why it is that there has been such an effort to defeat this bill.

It appears that in the early days of the administration they talked of an empty Treasury as a means of defeat. They undertook to say that it would break the Treasury. But the time finally came when the people of the country realized, when the ex-service men themselves realized, that that argument would no longer suffice, and then what do we find? We find this same Secretary of the Treasury still determined to defeat the measure with the greatest propaganda ever known in the country, saying that the time has now arrived when we may reduce taxation, but we can not do it if we pay an adjusted compensation.

The thought of a reduction of the burdens of government is always an enticing thing. It is something which we all desire.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The Senator has not any doubt, has he, that the reason why a bill in this form has been reported rather than a cash option bill is because the moneyed interests of the country have had such influence with the administration as to prevent any bill going through which would require an issue of bonds being placed upon the American market at this time?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I have no doubt of the truth of the statement just made by the Senator from Massachusetts. It is a statement which I think is borne out by the history of the proposed revenue legislation, to which I shall refer in just a moment.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BRUCE. I merely wish to say to the Senator from Massachusetts that it is hardly fair to some of us that he should ascribe our opposition to this bill to the Secretary of the Treasury or to the influence of mere wealth.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. If the Senator will pardon me I think I can answer him. The Senator from Massachusetts is looking at the question solely from a monetary point of view and the Senator from Maryland has in mind the opposition to the idea of a bonus altogether; so from the two points of view both Senators are correct, in my opinion.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. My question related only to the form of the legislation. In my opinion the reason why this form was chosen at this time and the whole principle of the cash basis rejected is that the financial interests of the country are opposed to a large bond issue being floated at this time. There may be no ground for that position, but that in my opinion is the reason why they are attacking the plan as they do.

Mr. BRUCE. I understand the Senator's position better now.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. As I said, there has never been such a propaganda in the country as I have observed in connection with the subject of tax reduction. The thought has gone out, and, if I may be permitted the expression, was sent out for the express purpose of making the great body of taxpayers in the country believe that they were to get some benefit from tax reduction; that it was to help everybody; that we were all going to feel lighter; that we would be more buoyant to go forward in the conduct of affairs of life.

But what do we find in the proposal of the Secretary of the Treasury? He submits a plan to Congress which does to some extent relieve individual income taxpayers of the lower brackets, but his great thought, his great purpose, was that the principal relief should be brought to those people of the country who are best able to bear the burdens of government. His position now is consistent with the position which he took in 1921, when the Congress passed the revenue law of that year. What did he do at that time? He insisted, and his will was carried out by the Congress, that all the excess-profits taxes should be absolutely repealed; that there should be one flat tax only upon corporations; that the tax which the corporations of moderate earnings had been paying should be increased, and those corporations earning the highest profits should have their taxes diminished about one-half. In 1921, in the year of extreme depression in business in the country, the excess-profits taxes paid for that year just about equalled the normal tax paid by the corporations, and by a repeal of the excess-profits tax at the instance of the Secretary of the Treasury there was a gift of almost 50 per cent of just taxes upon those corporations which were profiteering during the war and continuing to do so after the war.

Now, when we come to the revenue bill of this year we find that the Secretary of the Treasury insists that the surtaxes upon those with the greatest incomes shall be reduced by one-half, and that, too, is consistent with the attitude which he took in 1921. When the surtaxes reached as high as 65 per cent he went before the Congress, then as now controlled by a Republican majority, and insisted that those surtaxes should be cut from 65 per cent to 32 per cent. The House passed such a bill. It was reported to this body by the Finance Committee, but in the Senate we increased the surtaxes to 50 per cent. Now he comes again and wants to make another slice, and recommends and urges that the surtaxes shall be reduced from 50 per cent to 25 per cent. In a prepared statement he said that of all the questions involved in the situation the cutting in half of the high surtaxes is the one which shall and must be insisted upon. So it seems to me that the purpose behind the measure is easily discernible. At the very time the present Secretary of the Treasury entered upon his duty almost the first thing he did was to send a letter to the Congress opposing legislation of this sort.

Mr. President, I listened carefully to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]. I saw him paint a picture of the distress of the farmers of the country. I say to him that this debt will not be paid by the farmers of the country. But the burdens they are suffering are not these burdens. The taxes which they pay are almost entirely the taxes imposed by the States, taxes which they can not evade, which they can not shift, taxes which they must pay out of capital if they have no net earnings. But the taxes with which we are dealing in the proposed revenue bill and out of which we propose to pay the adjusted compensation come from those who have net incomes. The tax upon net incomes is not shifted. It is borne by the person who pays the tax. It is from that source that we expect this revenue. We expect it from the corporations which profited during the war and are continuing to this good hour, and from those who have the real ability to pay.

In this situation shall we undertake to say to the men to whom we believe we owe adjusted compensation that they shall have an insurance policy? If we owe a debt why should it not be paid? Why shall this great Government of ours stoop so low as to say to the men it drafted into the service of their country that they shall only receive their just deserts when they are dead? It is absolutely inconsistent with the very fundamental basis of the proposed legislation. My only desire is that the people of the country, the Nation itself, and this body which represents the people of the country shall say that we owe this debt, we have the ability to pay, and, God willing, we intend to perform our duty.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I have never before voiced my sentiments on the question of adjusted compensation. At first it seemed to me that perhaps the obligation of the citizen to save his country was one that did not partake of anything like a material reward. Rereading the history of the wars that have taken place in our country, I came to the conclusion that those who had criticized those who favor a compensation for the ex-soldiers had their terminology wrong.

I have had Senators on this floor speak to me about a soldier, an American citizen capable of bearing arms, being paid for his patriotism. That is not what I am standing here to advocate. I am advocating the righteousness of paying while fighting for his country—not for fighting for it but while fighting for it. We stand here and talk as though those who have been called upon to go out in the defense of their country ought to

do it at their own expense and at the risk of their lives and ask no consideration of those who can not, under the very nature of the case, participate in the conflict on the battle field, but who nevertheless are as much and as vitally interested in the outcome as the man who bears the shock of the conflict.

The hour is late, but I think, unless the debate shall close or some agreement is reached by which I can not express myself at length, I shall avail myself of the privilege of making a further statement as to the obligation of all the citizens to act for the salvation of the common country. I take it for granted that there is not a man on the floor of the Senate but knows that when war was declared between the United States and Germany it was a war declared on the part of all Americans against all of Germany. Had the conflict gone against us everyone in America would have suffered the consequences. The boys on the battle field were the first line of defense; they were the machinery which we had organized for the purpose of doing on the battle field what we hoped would redound to the safety of all the people and all the property in America.

When war was declared, what did we do? We sat down here in this Chamber and in the different departments of our common country and figured out what was necessary in order to win the war. First, so many men would be essential. Now, just let us get the material side of this question. It was not a question of voluntary enlistment. I sat in my place in this Chamber and voted for a draft law just as I would vote the rate of interest to be paid on the public debt. I voted from the material standpoint, regardless of what household or fire-side my vote would affect, to draft so many human units for the purpose of performing the material part of that warfare. Then it became essential for us to decide how much property it would take. Now listen. I am speaking of the purely material side of the war; the things which were essential in order to win it; not the sentimental element, not the patriotic element, but the pure, cold calculation as to what material things would be essential in order to win the war. First, was the man power; and without any regard to the flame of patriotism right at the beginning we sat in this Chamber and voted to draft between certain specified ages so many human units to go into the war and to do the fighting. We then provided for sufficient material units of a different kind.

We said to the human units, "We propose to send you abroad and to give you just enough to keep the machine running. If you are killed your material value to your family and to your community is no concern of ours. If it takes two years to win the war, the amount you will lose in actual material wealth to yourself is no concern of ours. We are going to furnish just enough lubrication in the form of a dollar a day to keep the machine running. If you are killed"—as I have stated, we said—"it is no concern of ours. If you are a total loss, it is no concern of ours. We are going to draft"—and we did draft—"for the immediate shock of battle 1,000,000 or 2,000,000 human units of a commercial value which is easily calculable." Any actuary, any statistician, can figure the average value and money worth of every man who went to the battle fields of France. We made no provision to pay any interest on what might be the commercial value of 2,000,000 human units.

Then we turned to the money. This is the comparison I want to make: We needed twenty-odd billion gold units. We had the human units; we selected the kind of human units we needed; but we did not calculate or make any arrangement about their commercial value. We simply took the human units. When we came to the gold soldiers or the gold units we wanted 25,000,000,000 of them. What did we say to them? We said to the gold soldiers, the gold units, "We will enter into a sacred bond with you that not one of you will be wounded or your fecundity impaired; we will enter into a bond that we shall bring every single gold unit back to its owner, bearing four and one-quarter children for every one hundred units; we will enter into a bond that every man, woman, and child in America shall see that that bond is satisfied."

I have before me a statement from the Treasury Department that we are paying this year \$940,000,000 in "pensions" to the "gold soldiers," who simply furnished the material that the human soldiers utilized, which brought about the glorious outcome of the war with Germany.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES], who has just taken his seat, gave us a long and elaborate statistical account of the Nation's finances and of the tremendous drain which, according to Mr. Mellon, the Treasury has been compelled to meet. What burden is this that we are bearing here to-day that Mr. Mellon says is an intolerable load and one to which the

American people can not stand the addition of another straw for fear it will break the camel's back? It is a pension on gold. We are willing to tax America to the last limit of endurance of the American people to pay the interest on bonds furnished by the beneficiaries of this war, and yet what is it proposed to do for the human units who have lost two years of their earning capacity when they come and say, "Pay us for the time lost—the material time lost while winning this war"? I do not say, mark you, "for winning the war," for we have not pencils enough or brains enough to calculate the relationship that an American citizen bears to the country he loves. So I do not put it in the category of patriotism, but as a debt that we owe the soldier to reimburse him for the time he lost, while we are reimbursing money for the time it lost or for our use of it. The idea of our standing here, with an interest total of \$1,062,000,000 on the gold we used, and refusing to pay \$1.25 a day additional to the men who made the gold possible.

We have two kinds of patriotism in this country. We have one kind spelled p-a-t-r-i-o-t-i-s-m and another one spelled p-a-y-t-r-i-o-t-i-s-m, and the army of the latter class of patriots is bigger than the army of the other class. We have plenty of "p-a-y-t-r-i-o-t-s," and our Secretary of the Treasury is one of those glorious "paytriots." Mr. President, it is a shame and a burning disgrace to the American Senate that we sit here and higgledy about paying \$1.25 as a part of the compensation to the boys who lost two years of their glorious youth and manhood in making possible the splendid "paytriotism" of Mr. Mellon and others.

I have heard the statement in the cloakrooms, "My boy does not want it." That is maudlin sentiment. If my family were beleaguered in some place where I might not go to their succor, and the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] was earning \$10 a day, and it would take him two days to go and relieve my family, and if I were to apply to him and he were to go and bring them back safe to me, could I calculate the debt of obligation that I should owe him? Never would any mention be made of the value of my returned family to me. No; but COPELAND lost two days, and he was earning \$10. I could pay him for that two days lost without ever compromising or even entering into the question of the obligation that I felt to him. We will never pay the boys that reflected such glory on America; a man would be a fool to try it. They are not asking us to pay them for what they did, but to pay them for the time lost while they were doing it. They are entitled to receive that much.

I had hoped that when we come to the discussion of this question we would lay aside all figuring and discard the fine-spun statistical abstracts laid on our desks designed to show whether or not we could spend a little bit more without batting an eye or having agitation of the heart. We are straining every nerve and going even into the devices of the dead in the shape of inheritance taxes to find money to pay the interest on the bonds—the "gold soldiers" that were obtained from the corporate mothers and fathers of this country. I had hoped that when we came to a discussion of this question we would view it from the standpoint of what was really due to the boys who did the work during the two years and lost that time, and consider it as a common-sense debt, an obligation that we owed to them. I have heard some men say, "Well, some of the boys are rich and do not want it." If I owe a millionaire \$5, it does not relieve my obligation one bit that he is a millionaire; a debt is a debt, it makes no difference to whom it is owed, whether he is worth a penny or whether he is worth a million dollars. So the question with us should be, What do we owe these boys for the time they lost on an average while they were abroad doing this work for us?

I had hoped we would come to the discussion of that, but we have not. We have not devised the most skillful method of paying the very least and taking the longest time and returning the most possible to the banking interests of this country. Take this bill, get a man skilled in the banking and insurance business, have him analyze it from start to finish, and you will find that it is the finest scheme by which the banking interests of this country may be indirectly promoted and the Government itself will pay out the least possible amount.

There is just one feature of this thing to which I want to call attention. Section 502 of the bill provides how the soldier may get a little pittance on his certificate. It provides that a member bank or any bank, trust company, or national bank may lend him a certain amount on his certificate, which may be rediscounted at what, for better definition, we call a regional bank. The regional bank may discount it at the rate then in effect for discounting prime commercial paper.

I have made some calculations on that. I have before me a table showing the amount of money that our 12 regional banks have made since the inauguration of the Federal reserve system. One of the Senators said to me that the amount being made by them now was inconsiderable; that they were hardly meeting expenses. I hope that the Senators on this floor who want to deal fairly with the question will analyze what I am now saying, or if not here, will do so in the Record.

Under our new banking and currency system we provide that the 12 regional banks shall not be allowed more than 6 per cent on the capital invested and that all in excess of 6 per cent upon the capital invested, after having met certain conditions which they have already met, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. We did not inaugurate these banks for the purpose of making money. We instituted them as great reserves that might meet, without oppression to the commercial world, the necessities of a great clearing house. Now, listen to what has occurred:

We inaugurated the system. It went into effect in 1914-15. The total interest they made on the capital invested that year was 1.18 per cent. In 1916 it was 4.99 per cent on the capital invested. In 1917 it was 18.9 per cent. In 1918 it was 72.6 per cent. In 1919 it was 98.2 per cent. In 1920 it was 160.7 per cent.

Let me pause right there for one moment so that you may appreciate what this thing means. Deducting from 160.7 per cent the 6 per cent they were allowed under the law for dividend purposes, there was covered back into the Treasury 154.7 per cent on the capital stock paid in, and the capital stock paid in was \$110,869,000. So that there was paid back into the Treasury a tax collected from the commercial organizations and from the business people of the country in the amount of something over \$220,000,000 in excess of 6 per cent upon the capital invested in the 12 regional banks.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. That profit was largely earned, was it not, upon the reserves carried by other banks with the Federal reserve banks?

Mr. SMITH. To be sure.

Mr. ADAMS. And upon which up to the present time no interest has been paid?

Mr. SMITH. Exactly.

Mr. ADAMS. It is not perhaps pertinent here, but it was suggested by the Senator's figures that perhaps the banks that furnish the capital ought to have some return upon the money that is earned on their reserves.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, this is just one of the ramifications of the juggling of the finances of this country that is making multimillionaires at the expense of the people who want to develop the wealth of this country. As the Senator from Colorado says, a large percentage of this amount was made because the law required the member banks to deposit with these regional banks a certain reserve on which they receive no interest, but which is a part of the working capital of the regional banks. That, however, is not germane to what I am driving at now.

In 1921 the money earned on the capital invested in our 12 regional banks dropped to 85.1 per cent. In 1922, strangely enough, it was 19.9 per cent, and in 1923 it was 19.2 per cent.

Now, listen: We propose, in section 502 of the nondescript thing that we have here, the following manner in which the soldiers are to avail themselves of cash on their certificates:

A loan may be made to a veteran upon his adjusted service certificate only in accordance with the provisions of this section.

What are the provisions of the section?

Any national bank, or any bank or trust company incorporated under the laws of any State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia (hereinafter in this section called "bank"), is authorized—

To do what? To do this:

The rate of interest charged upon the loan by the bank—

That is, the bank that takes the note—

shall not exceed, by more than 2 per cent per annum, the rate charged at the date of the loan for the discount of 90-day commercial paper under section 13 of the Federal reserve act by the Federal reserve bank for the Federal reserve district in which the bank is located.

That means that if the rate of discount at the regional bank is 5 per cent, then, the local bank charging 2, the soldier dis-

counts his certificate at 7 per cent. Under an average of 5 per cent discount at the regional bank, they have made the fabulous sums that I have here shown, and they go back into the Treasury of the United States. If they make an average of as low as 20 per cent upon a rediscount rate of 5 per cent upon a rediscount rate of 2 per cent, they would make more than enough to meet the 6 per cent allowed as a dividend on the capital invested. Therefore if the people who drafted this bill had wanted to deal fairly with the soldier they should have said that the bank, trust company, State or national bank that received the note and the certificate as security might have 2 per cent, but that the regional bank accepting the paper for rediscount should not charge over $1\frac{1}{2}$ or 2 per cent. Why? Because the amount of money earned by our regional banks has already demonstrated that 2 per cent would more than pay a profit of from 10 to 12 per cent upon the capital invested; and as this does not come in the category of prime commercial paper—it is a Government obligation—why should the Government want to make money out of its soldiers after it has provided even this niggardly method of helping them?

Mr. OWEN. We are in the money-making business.

Mr. SMITH. Yes; we are in the money-making business, and that is the reason why the soldier has no more hope than the famous snowball in Africa.

Mr. President, I have an amendment. The reason why I am not going to pay any attention to this bill is because I see every evidence that this bill has been fixed up by the majority party, and I presume that they have some telepathic way of knowing what His Excellency in the White House is going to do, for I heard the strangest argument here this morning from the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BURSUM]. He said it did not make any difference if every man in the Senate and every man in the House voted for the cash option; for some sort of reason it would not become law. When asked by another Senator if that meant that the President would veto it, he said he was not referring to the President. Somehow or other it would just take foot-and-mouth disease and die on the way. It could not become law.

Of course he was not going to have the President held responsible for doing anything against the soldier. His party will need the soldier's vote in the coming election; and they have gerrymandered this thing until they have bamboozled some people into believing that they are going to get it.

I say that I am not even going to stand here and advocate a cash bonus, because since these telegrams have come from the leaders of the Legion saying that they want the bill just as it is, without dotting an "i" or crossing a "t," verbatim et literatim et spellatim, I am going to let them have it just as they want it. I want it understood, however, that it is purely, unadulteratedly the result of Republican conception. This is the child born of the generous womb of the Republican Finance Committee, and I want the soldiers to see the fruit of it; and two years from to-day, when an overwhelming Democratic Senate shall be here, and a Democratic House, and a Democratic President, I expect us to amend this bill and to give the soldiers what in justice, reason, and common sense they are entitled to.

But I am going to risk even going against some of the soldiers—no, I beg the soldier's pardon, I did not mean that; I mean some of the gentlemen who are speaking for them, their commanders. I am going to offer the following amendment, and I hope the secretary will take it down, for I have not written it out. I want to offer the amendment now so that it may be pending, amending section 502, as follows: On line 22, page 13 of the bill, to strike out the words "more than"; on line 23, after the word "charged," to strike out all down to and including the word "act" in line 25; and on line 2, page 14, after the word "located," to insert the following proviso:

"Provided, That the rate of discount by the Federal reserve bank on the promissory notes secured by adjusted service certificates, as provided in this section, shall not exceed a rate of 2 per cent per annum."

So that the regional bank rediscounting the paper can charge but 2, and the bank which accepts the note secured by the certificate may charge 2, and the soldier will get his loan at a discount of 4 per cent. Upon a calculation, if a billion dollars of the possible \$3,000,000,000 which it is calculated this may cost is rediscounted in this manner, that saving of 3 per cent will amount to \$30,000,000 saving annually to the soldier if, under the terms of the bill, he must rediscount every nine months.

As I said, I had hoped that we were going to approach this question in a nonpartisan spirit, and settle it as we, in our judgment, thought the boys ought to be settled with, but since the statements made by Senators on the other side, it appears

that this is a purely partisan administration bill, and the power of the Executive is such, and the necessity for a two-thirds vote to pass it over his veto, according to the statements of certain Senators on the other side, is so small, that I want here and now to record myself as reluctantly acquiescing in this thing; no, I do not want to put it that way. I mean I submit to the requests of the officers of the Legion and the power of the other side, and let this purely partisan "patriotic" Republican majority take charge of it and run it until such time as we get a chance to change things.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from South Carolina state whether the changes proposed by him are to be considered as a single amendment?

Mr. SMITH. They are, Mr. President, because they are all offered as an amendment to section 502, and all pertain to identically the same matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The proposed amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, the eloquent and impressive speech of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], together with the economic theory which he advocated, have impelled me to a brief reply. If his great and eloquent picture of the whole economic situation were complete, I should agree with his conclusions, but he has drawn only a corner of the economic situation as it exists in the United States. It is the agricultural corner which he has painted. With that picture of agriculture I entirely agree. His description is complete. But while he is announcing the distress of agriculture, what is the picture of other business in the United States?

As I take up the morning paper and the evening paper, I read the most glowing accounts of prosperity ever printed in the history of our country. The United States Steel Corporation takes profits as great as they have ever been. The whole steel industry is in line with this dominant leader in that field. If you go into the oil industry, you find the same story and the same picture of prosperity, alongside of this picture of distress among the farmers.

To-day we took testimony in the investigating committee concerning the great lumber industry which affects every home builder in the United States, and their prices are more than 200 per cent of the pre-war prices, as compared with the farmers' prices slightly below the pre-war level. The prosperity of the railroads is unequalled and except where affected by agriculture, the banks are reaping a golden harvest.

The Senator from Idaho, in drawing his wonderful picture, has omitted all this. I could take hours in describing the prosperity of other business and other enterprises in the United States, but these few minutes will suffice. I will total it all up by calling attention to the fact, as shown by the yearbook for 1921, these other enterprises in our country had a net profit of \$21,000,000,000, while agriculture sustained a loss.

It is not fair for the distinguished Senator from Idaho to pick out one portion of depression in our country and base his whole conclusion as to taxation upon the conditions of that one portion of our people. Along with these farmers that have been brought to the distress which he so truthfully described are the men drafted at \$30 per month. Four million of those boys, a large percentage of them farmers, and another large percentage of them laborers, were drafted and taken by their Government to serve at an arbitrary compensation, regardless of the economic value of the service. While they were performing that service this great industrial America was reaping the greatest profit ever taken in the history of the world. These excess profits are another system of taxation—taxation without representation and paid by the toll of those who work.

This burden of taxation which the Senator so eloquently mentioned is not altogether taxation levied by the power of the Government. The farmers of this country, now paying 65 per cent, on an average, more than they paid before the war, selling at less than they received before the war, were brought to this unequal condition, not alone by the taxation levied by State and National Governments, but more, ten times more, by the taxation through profits levied by the power of monopoly. That great proposition is entirely overlooked by the distinguished Senator from Idaho. He saw the one corner of the picture and forgot all the rest.

Since this taxation through profits, reaping these vast billions from the farmers, from the soldiers, and from the common people of the country, is levied by the private power of economic organizations, I stand ready to equalize that injustice by a form of Government taxation that will do something toward justice for the soldiers of the United States. I stand ready to even up somewhat of that discrimination.

We can no longer sit back and assume that the economic organizations of this country are just and right to everybody

in everything. The source of their income and of their profits must be analyzed, and in the taking of the evidence to-day in regard to the lumber industry we found that in the very letters they wrote to one another they said, "We had better hold our meetings in jail, where we belong."

These combinations are often organized in violation of law. Yet in the day when the soldier is without a job, when the soldier is without a few hundred dollars to start his course in life, these gigantic profits and this wonderful prosperity of every other business are evident everywhere. I say that the danger is not in overtaxation by the power of government. The danger is in the great private institutions which, by their power, are able to levy profits as a government levies taxes.

I am in accord with what the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] has said in reference to the Federal reserve banking system. I know that its policy of deflation contributed more than any other one cause to this inequality between agriculture and other business. Timed as it was, striking the farmer at harvest time, I know that it produced a panic in his prices, and from that panic he has never recovered to this moment.

Under that situation I do not come before the Senate or the country to advocate a taxation of farmers. What farmer pays an income tax in these days? The farmer who did would be a curiosity in a museum now. The farmer has no income. His profits are on the red side of the account.

We are to vote in a few days upon a tax bill which will determine who will pay the bonus to the soldiers. I stand for figuring out in our economic situation those who owe the bonus to the soldiers of the World War. I want to figure out those profiteers who took profits during the war, and building their fortunes upon those profits continue to take profits in peace. I shall offer an amendment—in fact, I have already offered an amendment—to the tax bill to put back the excess-profits taxes. The curse of this generation is excess profits. It is excess profits that are driving us to all of our troubles. It is excess profits which the statesmen of this generation must remedy. The old competitive system of business, organized as it is upon a theory of taking all it can grasp, taking it lawfully if it can, and unlawfully if it must, must be ended in this country. That is the system of taxation that threatens to throw down the American Government. That is the system of taxation that is overturning hopes, filing petitions in bankruptcy, and upsetting the calculations of political logic. That is the system of taxation which the great American people will no longer tolerate. They will revise it, and they will tax the great combinations to pay a little bit of the compensation that justly belongs to the soldiers of the World War.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I have in my hand a telegram from the American Legion commander of Wyoming, which I ask may be read at the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read as requested.

The reading clerk read as follows:

CHEYENNE, WYO., April 22, 1924.

Hon. F. E. WARREN,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Department of Wyoming American Legion requests you oppose vigorously inclusion cash option in bonus bill. We stand squarely for bill as passed by House.

M. S. REYNOLDS,

Department Commander.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, it is my purpose to support the adjusted compensation bill as it came from the House. When the matter of adjusted compensation in the previous Congress came before the Senate and was vetoed by President Harding, I voted to sustain the veto because of the representations made at that time by Secretary Mellon that the country was facing a very large deficit; because there was no proper provision made in the bill by which the funds required by the United States Treasury to meet the charges were to be supplied; and for the further reason that I did not feel at liberty to impose so large a tax upon the people of my own State without any expression from them. Since that time a vote has been taken in my State, and, of those who voted upon the question of a soldiers' bonus, so called, a majority voted for the bonus. It was a State bonus which the people of Oklahoma proposed to tax themselves to pay. The Oklahoma bonus was defeated, however, because it required a majority of all those who voted in the election and that majority was not obtained.

I think the soldiers' bonus or adjusted compensation is justified as a matter of common right and common sense. These men are not to be paid for fighting for the country. They are to be paid for the period of time during which they were fighting for their country, and they are being paid a very small sum,

indeed, considering the character of the service upon which they were engaged.

I am also in favor of a most substantial reduction of taxes in the country.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he passes from the bonus question, if he is going to discuss the tax question?

Mr. OWEN. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does not the Senator think that the bill passed by the House, providing as it does that only after a few years any soldier can even borrow as much as \$87, is but poor recompense and hardly sufficient to be considered very seriously by the American people?

Mr. OWEN. I regard the bill as inadequate.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think it is very inadequate.

Mr. OWEN. I regard the measure as inadequate, but if we insist upon an amendment at this time which is more generous it means defeat of the measure itself in view of the President's veto and the probable result.

Mr. McKELLAR. Why does the Senator say that?

Mr. OWEN. I say that because I am convinced that there will not be enough votes to pass the bill over the veto with the money payment proposed included.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am rather inclined to differ with the Senator about that.

Mr. OWEN. I do not want to take any chance about it. When the bill is passed and becomes a law it may be amended by a future Democratic Congress under a Democratic President.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will it not happen that the moment the bill is passed there will be a desire on the part of the ex-soldiers and the ex-service men of the country to amend the law so as to provide a real compensation instead of this makeshift?

Mr. OWEN. I think there may arise a demand for having the certificates made negotiable upon a better basis and to give an option to receive cash in lieu of insurance.

I favor the present adjustment because it is the best which seems to be certain of being passed over the President's veto. I assume he is going to veto the bill. I fear if the bill is loaded down it may fail to get a two-thirds vote here and in the other House and will thus be defeated. I want the bill to pass and become a law. I want it to become an accomplished fact. Then the friends who want to have the law modified afterwards will have their chance under more favorable circumstances.

Mr. President, there is in my judgment no reason why there should not be a very large reduction of taxes even to the extent in volume as proposed by the Mellon bill, so called, because the only thing necessary to enable that to be done, and to pay a cash bonus besides for that matter, is to deal with the public debt of the United States on the same generous terms that we accorded to the taxpayers of Great Britain in paying the British debt to the United States. We all remember very well what that basis was. There was a plan by which it was extended about 60 years. If the American people were taxed on the basis of 4½ per cent on the debt with one-half of one per cent used as amortization, in 50 years the sum would be liquidated and we would only be paying interest at 4½ per cent on the amount of the current debt instead of liquidating the principle of the debt by over a billion annually.

But there are those—and I think the view is strongly represented here in the Senate and it is certainly represented strongly by Mr. Mellon, the Secretary of the Treasury—who demand the earliest possible liquidation of the war debt or as rapidly as it can be extorted from the taxpayers of America. That is their policy. I suppose I may say the Republican policy. That is why we were compelled to face an alleged deficit. It is because a part of the calculations from which the deficit arose was a submerged, out-of-view consideration that we had to pay not less than a billion dollars a year on the principal of the war debt.

That is the policy of those who have wrecked the business of the country by bringing on the terrible industrial depressions of 1920-1923 and have ruined agriculture in the country in the manner so eloquently portrayed by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]. It was the stand-pat Republican deflation of credit and of currency. They have surely deflated the currency as well as credit. Look at the bills in your pocket now, if you have any of them, and you will find they are gold certificates, in effect. Why? Because the Federal reserve notes are being taken out of circulation and gold certificates being substituted. Why? It is to make the dollar more difficult to get. That is the policy of those who have much against the interests of those who have little.

It is an old story. There is nothing new about it. It is a policy of making the dollar as difficult as possible to get. It is a like policy which the great monopolists pursue of making goods difficult to get by raising the prices so high that the consumers, having difficulty in getting them, will pay an extortionate profit in the purchase.

Mr. President, the greatest need of America is production. Those who stand in the way of production ought to be treated as those who are obstructing the national prosperity and the national welfare. They ought to be induced by proper processes, moderate and gentle but firm, to be content with a reasonable profit on turnover, so that the consumption of the country shall increase and thereby production increase, because it must be remembered that consumption and production, like the Siamese twins, are inextricably bound together of necessity. Unless men can consume, other men need not produce. Men can not consume unless they themselves are producing. When we have deflation of credit and currency, as was put on in this country, as under the declared policy of the Republican platform of 1890, it has the effect of paralyzing the consuming power of those engaged in agriculture.

Their production brought not a sufficient amount to enable them to buy freely of the production of those engaged in the manufacturing enterprises of the country, and that brought a period of depression and stringency for the producers of the whole country.

So I insist we should not require the war debt to be treated as if it were an inflation of credit requiring speedy deflation. It was not truly an inflation of credit. Inflation of credit means the unjustified expansion of credit. It was not an unjustified expansion of credit when we used the credit of the Nation to save the life of the Nation. It was a fully justified expansion of credit and thoughtful statesmen ought not to treat it as requiring deflation. The fact is, however, that this false policy has been pursued vigorously and is still being pursued. Liquidation is not complete in the country. It is going on now, and the harmful effect still being felt throughout the country, while if that policy be persisted in it will naturally retard for a while the natural reaction from depression to prosperity.

I am of opinion that if the Nation should adopt the policy of postponing the liquidation of the debt of the United States by an amortization policy such as I have suggested, practically upon the same lines that we have extended to British taxpayers, we could make a reduction in taxes of over a half billion more than proposed in the United States and pass the soldiers' bonus bill as well.

But I will go further than that, Mr. President. It is not the proper remedy in dealing with the monopolies of this country to tax their excess profits. That is standing by and profiting by sharing with them in a policy which is fundamentally and economically false. When they are preventing production in obtaining these excess profits they should be restrained. Unless the Senate can comprehend what it means, and how to prevent it, when the policy is pursued by the great enterprises of this country which prevents production, we shall not have relief. That problem must be understood. It is not well understood now. The great thing in this country is production and the stimulation of production—"to make things, to grow things, to carry," and merchandise things. That comprises the activity of modern life, and the men who do not understand that that is the real problem can not be as useful as they could be in helping to bring about the prosperity which the intelligence and activity of the American people justify.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its session to-day it take a recess until 10 o'clock to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, is it essential to make the hour of meeting to-morrow 10 o'clock rather than 11 o'clock?

Mr. CURTIS. I think it is, because we would like to get a vote upon the pending bill early to-morrow. I intend to make another request for unanimous consent, after the one I have made shall have been acted upon, in order to see if we can not get through with the bill early to-morrow. I hope the Senator from Colorado will not object to our meeting at 10 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I join in the hope expressed by the Senator from Kansas. Arrangements which were effected two months ago make it necessary for me to leave the city to-morrow afternoon, and I should very much like to have a vote on the pending bill prior to leaving. Full opportunity has been and will be afforded for debate. I wish to suggest to the Senator from Kansas that he couple with his

request for unanimous consent a suggestion, or submit another request for unanimous consent, which will contemplate a final disposition of the pending bill to-morrow.

Mr. CURTIS. It was my intention, if the unanimous consent which I have asked shall be agreed to, to ask that after 11 o'clock to-morrow debate on the bill be limited to five minutes and that on all amendments to the bill debate be limited to 10 minutes.

Mr. ROBINSON. That arrangement would suit me entirely.

Mr. CURTIS. In that way we can get through with the bill by 3 o'clock or half-past 3 o'clock to-morrow. I renew my request for unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business to-day it take a recess until 10 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CURTIS. Now, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that beginning at the hour of 11 o'clock to-morrow all debate on House bill 7959 be limited to 10 minutes on amendments, and that the debate be limited to five minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kansas asks unanimous consent that after the hour of 11 o'clock to-morrow debate be limited to 10 minutes upon any amendment which may be offered and to five minutes upon the bill itself. Is there objection?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Senator refers to debate by each Senator?

Mr. CURTIS. To debate by each Senator, with no Senator speaking more than once.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CURTIS obtained the floor.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President—

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

INVESTIGATION OF INTERNAL REVENUE BUREAU

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, there are pending before the Senate two resolutions relating to the investigation of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. It is my hope that an arrangement may be effected for the consideration and disposition of both those resolutions. As I stated a moment ago, it is my intention, in pursuance of arrangements made some months ago, to leave the city to-morrow for a necessary absence of 10 days.

I have discussed the matter with some of the Senators on the other side of the Chamber and some on this side, and, in pursuance of that consultation, I ask unanimous consent that on the 6th day of May when the Senate shall convene it shall proceed to the consideration of the resolution submitted by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] to authorize the select committee charged with the investigation of the Bureau of Internal Revenue to employ counsel, experts, and accountants, and that upon the disposition of that resolution, if the author of the resolution decides to do so, the Senate shall proceed at once to the consideration and disposition of the resolution offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], providing for the discontinuance of the investigation, my object being to secure from the Senate an expression of opinion upon both of the resolutions. If the resolution of the Senator from New Mexico should be agreed to, and the committee be authorized to employ counsel, I apprehend that the resolution of the Senator from Indiana probably would not be pursued. On the other hand, if the Senate should decline to give permission for the employment of counsel, the Senate in all probability would want to dispose of the resolution of the Senator from Indiana.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. CURTIS. If the Senator will modify his request so as to make the consideration of the resolution commence immediately after the routine morning business, I think it would be better.

Mr. ROBINSON. I will be glad to do that. I modify my request so that the resolution shall be taken up for consideration immediately after the conclusion of the routine morning business.

Mr. CURTIS. I will state that I have talked with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], and the proposal is satisfactory to him.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands that the request is that at the conclusion of the routine morning business on the morning of May 6 the Senate shall proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution No. 211, offered by the Senator from New Mexico, and that upon the disposition of that resolution the Senate shall proceed to the consideration of

Senate Resolution No. 210, offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Watson].

Mr. CURTIS. If the Senator who submitted that resolution so desires.

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes; I made it conditional for the reasons I have already stated; so that if the author of Senate Resolution No. 210, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Watson], desires to proceed to the consideration of his resolution, the Senate shall do so at once upon the conclusion of the consideration of the resolution of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Jones].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The modification will be included in the request. As so modified, is there objection?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I have not had an opportunity to examine the resolution of the Senator from New Mexico. Does it do anything except authorize the committee to employ counsel?

Mr. ROBINSON. To employ counsel, experts, and accountants.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It covers nothing but that?

Mr. ROBINSON. It covers nothing but that subject.

Mr. JONES of Washington. May I ask the Senator if his proposal for unanimous consent contemplates the disposition of the resolution on that day?

Mr. ROBINSON. No; it contemplates a final disposition of both resolutions under the conditions that I have stated, but it does not limit the time in which the Senate may act upon them.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Might not that interfere with the consideration of appropriation bills and other measures of considerable importance? I think the resolution ought to be disposed of that afternoon.

Mr. ROBINSON. I have no objection if an agreement to that effect may be reached. It would suit me very much better.

Mr. CURTIS. We can not enter into that kind of an agreement for the final disposition of the resolution without a quorum being called.

Mr. ROBINSON. That is why I put the request in the form I have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. JONES of Washington. If other Senators have considered the situation and the proposal is agreeable to them, I shall not interpose an objection. I think, however, the resolutions ought to be disposed of on the afternoon of the day they are taken up, as I do not believe their consideration ought to proceed indefinitely.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

INDIANS OF NISQUALLY RESERVATION, WASH.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1704) for the relief of the dispossessed allotted Indians in the Nisqually Reservation, Wash., which were on page 1, line 3, after the word "hereby" to insert "authorized to be"; on page 2, line 5, after the word "hereby," to insert "authorized to be"; and on page 2, line 6, to strike out the words "shall be immediately available and."

Mr. JONES of Washington. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 15 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Wednesday, April 23, 1924, at 10 o'clock a. m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 22 (legislative day of April 21), 1924

JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Robert E. Mattingly to be judge of the municipal court.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY

Jack Hayes to be colonel, Quartermaster Corps.

Frank Geere to be lieutenant colonel, Coast Artillery Corps.

John Hobert Wallace to be major, Field Artillery.

Truman Wike Allen to be captain, Air Service.

Charles Humphrey Swick to be captain, Corps of Engineers.

Victor Leander Oleson to be captain, Field Artillery.

Harold Allen Brown to be first lieutenant, Infantry.

Albert Sidney Johnston Stovall, jr., to be first lieutenant, Cavalry.

Donald Carson Hardin to be first lieutenant, Infantry.

Wayne Clifton Zimmerman to be first lieutenant, Infantry.

John Thomas Keeley to be first lieutenant, Infantry.

Cornelius Emmett O'Connor to be second lieutenant, Air Service.

Richard Briggs Evans to be second lieutenant, Cavalry.

George Leftwich Wertenbaker to be lieutenant colonel, Coast Artillery Corps.

Raymond Marsh to be major, Field Artillery.

Walter Buford to be captain, Cavalry.

Joseph Conrad Odell to be first lieutenant, Infantry.

Josiah Toney Dalbey to be first lieutenant, Infantry.

Logan Osburn Shutt to be first lieutenant, Infantry.

John Albert Chambers to be second lieutenant, Corps of Engineers.

Franklin Mitchell to be second lieutenant, Ordnance Department.

Frank Curtis Mellon to be captain, Field Artillery.

Auby Casey Strickland to be first lieutenant, Air Service.

Hugo Peoples Rush to be second lieutenant, Air Service.

POSTMASTERS

ILLINOIS

Annette G. Ferguson, Annawan.

George W. Fritz, Durand.

Mary Slocum, Franklin Park.

Fred W. Newman, Grand Ridge.

Rose C. Auth, Rankin.

John Van Antwerp, Sparland.

IOWA

Melvin V. Smith, Akron.

Celia T. Green, Mystic.

NORTH CAROLINA

Christopher C. Snead, Laurel Hill.

Herbert O. Sink, Sanatorium.

OKLAHOMA

William T. Bratton, Guymon.

TENNESSEE

William J. O'Callaghan, Nashville.

Rufus N. McCaslin, Dickson.

William R. Williams, Bells.

Retha Fortner, Cumberland Gap.

James F. Toney, jr., Erwin.

Alice L. Needham, Trimble.

WEST VIRGINIA

Michael H. Duncan, Crumpler.

WYOMING

Edna M. Booth, Sunrise.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, April 22, 1924

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Rev. Joseph Dawson, pastor of the Trinity Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for all Thy goodness to us, for the way Thou hast led us as individuals and as a Nation. We ask for Thy guidance to continue. We pray that wisdom may be given us at all times and under all circumstances that we may follow in the right path and do that which will enrich the world and bring us into closer fellowship with Thee. We pray Thee to give wisdom to our President, to his Cabinet, to the Houses of Congress, and to all who seek to uplift and enrich the world morally and materially. We ask it in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE STAR-SPANGLED BANNER—MAKE IT OUR NATIONAL ANTHEM

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of a bill pending to make the Star-Spangled Banner the national anthem. These remarks were made before the Judiciary Committee and also over the radio.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on December 10, 1923, I introduced the following joint resolution as House Joint Resolution 69, proposing the adoption of the Star-Spangled Banner as the national anthem:

Whereas the Star-Spangled Banner for more than a century of use has become deeply enshrined in our hearts as the anthem of our country; and

Whereas tradition and history have always associated the melody and words of this immortal song with heroic deeds and patriotic endeavor; and

Whereas both the Army and Navy have adopted it as their anthem; and

Whereas on occasions certain musical conductors have been guilty of refusing to play it: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the Star-Spangled Banner be adopted and authorized as the national anthem of the United States of America, and that recognition be given to it as such on all appropriate occasions.

I offered the resolution at the request of the American Legion, New York State Department. My colleague, Mr. LINTHICUM, of Maryland, has likewise introduced a measure for this purpose, namely (H. R. 6429). Either measure seeks to give long-withheld official recognition to the song—seeks to rescue it from treasonable attacks recently made upon it in newspaper advertisements—seeks to protect it against aspersions cast upon it by certain unpatriotic people. The song, however, has endured all onslaughts. It is century old. Such age-worn choice of the people is irrevocable. It will not down. It is as deathless as the flag which bears its name. It requires official status. Passage of either measure will dramatize its importance and will forever still its detractors. Congressional and presidential approval would merely be the concrete expression of the national wish. Then, indeed, will have been realized the cherished hope of our late lamented President Harding to have this undying song the hymn of the Nation.

The Star-Spangled Banner was written by Francis Scott Key, an eminent lawyer of Georgetown-Washington, during our second war with Great Britain. Great Britain had contemplated a threefold attack upon the United States—by way of the Chesapeake against Baltimore, by way of the Delaware against Philadelphia, and by way of the Hudson against New York. The enemy had already forced its way into Washington, and the Capitol itself was in flames. The people were alarmed and truly distressed.

Admiral Cochrane, in command of British forces, was now attacking Fort M'Henry, which guarded Baltimore; and Francis Scott Key, a temporary prisoner on a British cartel ship, anxiously watched through the night of September 13, 1814, the attack upon the fort.

To visualize better the situation: Suppose you were held upon a tiny vessel in New York Bay off Staten Island and the enemy ships were firing their guns upon the fort at Governors Island. Only the bravery and stout hearts of its garrison and the resistance of its batteries stands between the British and capture of New York. You, like Key, would indeed be terror stricken and fearful of the outcome. And so Key watched and waited.

Ofttimes the smoke from the shells and mists from the sea completely hid the flag over the fort. During the night the darkness blotted it out entirely, except when "the rockets' red glare gave proof * * * that the flag was still there." Thus his joy knew no bounds when he saw the British withdraw. Their plans were frustrated. The country was spared defeat. While still on the cartel boat he began to write on the back of an old letter and envelope the lines of that inspiring song that is sung wherever Old Glory is unfurled.

Some one once said:

Let me write the songs of a people, and I care not who makes their laws.

Nothing truer has come from the wit of man. For songs of a people are the embodiment of their finer instincts. They come trippingly to the tongue, without guile, without sophistry. And thus they are handed down from generation to generation in all purity and innocence. This truth is completely demonstrated in the appeal which the Star-Spangled Banner has made to the American people from the day it came from the poet's pen.

Of course, if we make the song our national anthem, thus following the examples of many other nations, it must be remembered we do not provide punishment for failure to sing the song.

At this point I desire to insert my statement before the House Judiciary Committee and colloquy with its members:

For that reason I, in my resolution, do not go as far as Mr. LINTHICUM does in his bill. He has made this a regular bill, to be passed by both Houses and signed by the President. But I think that this proposition does not rise to the dignity of a statute or a bill.

I think that it must take an inferior course in this sense. My idea was to simply get the National Legislature to approve this song, with the President's signature, and for that reason I made my proposition in the form of a House joint resolution.

I think there is a great deal of precedent for it, with all due respect to Mr. LINTHICUM, who introduced the bill. I find in the manual that there is quite a distinction, as you all know, between a bill, a concurrent resolution, and a joint resolution. But we find this very clear language with reference to a House joint resolution:

"They are used for what may be called the incidental, unusual, or inferior purposes of legislation, as extending the national thanks to individuals, the invitation to Lafayette to visit America, the welcome to Kossuth, or notice to a foreign government of an abrogation of a treaty, or the correction of an error in an existing act of the legislature."

In other words, instead of making this a bill, like a bill for an appropriation, or something akin to that, we simply go on record, if we adopt this resolution, as saying to the people of the country, "This is our national anthem, worthy of every man, woman, and child to sing, and we suggest to you that you do sing it."

Now, there is plenty of precedent for an enactment of that sort in other lands.

Mr. DYER. There is no difference between the two, in effect?

Mr. CELLER. There probably is no difference, except that I have in mind there might be a great deal of difficulty in getting a bill enacted. This very question I adverted to might be raised; one form of enactment, I presume, is of greater weight than another; not actually, but probably potentially, and for that reason I thought it might be more apropos to make this a House joint resolution. They probably would have the same effect, but there must be some distinction, otherwise we, who are working in the House, would not make that distinction, one a House joint resolution and one an ordinary bill.

Mr. MONTAGUE. A joint resolution is a resolution passed by the House and the Senate, is it not?

Mr. CELLER. A joint resolution is passed by the House and the Senate and signed by the President.

Mr. MONTAGUE. And a concurrent resolution?

Mr. CELLER. Is not signed by the President, but is passed by both Houses.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Your resolution, then, has to go through the exact procedure—

Mr. CELLER (interposing). As the passage of a bill, but I did not think it well to make it a concurrent resolution, because I thought it would be well to have the approval of the President for all that it might be worth. His approval, of course, carries with it a great deal of conviction and encouragement.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I want to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the flag was enlarged by an act providing for additional stars on April 4, 1818. I do not see any difference between an act and a resolution—a joint resolution.

Mr. CELLER. I imagine there might be the necessity in order to have an additional star to have it in the form of a bill. There would be the necessity for it there, because it was something, I presume, which would be of greater importance to the country at large than the mere approval given to a national anthem.

Mr. PERLMAN. What is the need for your fourth "whereas" clause?

Mr. CELLER. I have no penchant for any language there. It could be readily amended. That probably might be a little scheme of mine to bring before those who consider it, at first glance, the fact that the Army and the Navy have adopted it as their national anthem.

Mr. PERLMAN. That is the third "whereas" clause. I have reference to the next "whereas" clause.

Mr. CELLER. There again it is informative, because I have in mind the fact that Doctor—I do not remember his name, the leader of the Boston Symphony Orchestra, in New York and elsewhere, refused to play the song.

This was during the war. He was a German, and he claimed that the rhythm and the meter was unmusical. That, of course, was found to be mere subterfuge and a cloak to disguise his real feelings in the matter.

He did not want to play the national anthem for reasons best known to himself.

I have in mind also the fact that a musician in Central Park, N. Y., hired by the municipal authorities to play concerts there, refused likewise to play it for reasons best known to himself. There have been innumerable instances of that sort, and that is why I put those words in that "whereas" clause, so as to give the gentleman some information on the subject. Probably it has no place there, but that is the explanation of it.

I have taken the trouble to find out what has been the practice of other nations with respect to national anthems.

I have before me, which I will be glad to read, a letter from Ambassador Jusserand, with reference to the Marseillaise. He writes me as follows, in part:

After various vicissitudes, the song having been strictly barred and forbidden during the second empire, on the 4th of February, 1879, a bill was introduced before our parliament for a recognition of the Marseillaise being henceforth the national hymn of our country. But it was recalled in the same sitting of the chamber that the decree of the Year III had never been formally abrogated and that it was deemed better to simply acknowledge that it continued in full force, which was done.

He had in mind the fact that the Marseillaise had been declared the national anthem of France by a decree of Messidor the twenty-sixth, Year III of the Republic; so we have France on record as having adopted a national anthem.

I have a letter here from the ambassador from Italy. He writes me to state that they have no official national anthem, although the Royal March has been recognized as such in the King's regulations.

The situation, of course, in Italy is somewhat anomalous, because we have only had the unification of Italy for a comparatively short period. Italy, of course, you may recall, before the unification was a medley of small provinces and nations and each one of those provinces, like the Province of Piedmont and the city of Venice and the island of Sicily and Calabria, etc., had their individual national anthem.

Of course, there would be great difficulty, which you can easily recognize, in trying to reconcile that heterogeneous group of people, with all their different national aims and aspirations in singing one song. For that reason it might be difficult, and has always been difficult, for the Italian Chamber of Deputies to pass a national anthem.

But, the King, within his rights, has issued edicts that the Royal March shall be deemed the national anthem of Italy.

The situation with reference to Japan is set forth in a letter which I received from the ambassador. I should like to have the letter incorporated in the Record.

The letter is as follows:

DECEMBER 27, 1923.

HON. EMANUEL CELLER,
51 Chambers Street, New York City.

DEAR SIR: I am directed by the ambassador to acknowledge the receipt of your letter dated December 21, and in reply I wish to inform you that Kimigayo was authorized as the national anthem of Japan officially in 1890. The words are by an old anonymous poet. The poem is found in the Kokin-waka-shu, an old book of verse, compiled in 902-907 A. D. The music was composed by Hiromori Hayashi in 1879. The song was originally used by the Japanese army and navy as the national anthem. In 1890 the department of education issued a proclamation pertaining to the adoption of Kimigayo as the national anthem. Since then the song has been sung widely and generally on various occasions by the Japanese nation. Incidentally, I am sending you a copy of Kimigayo.

Hoping this information will serve you, I am,
Very truly yours,

S. TAKETOMI, Secretary.

The German ambassador informs me that although there is no official or legislative authority as such, nevertheless, in the various kingdoms of Germany before the war there was official recognition given to Deutschland, Deutschland, Über Alles, as the national anthem of Germany.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There was no legislative recognition?

Mr. CELLER. No national legislation recognition. There is, I am informed, in the local kingdoms, but not in the national Bundesrath, or Reichsrath, before the war. I do not know the situation after the war.

I also received a letter from the Legation of Poland, telling me Poland is Not Yet Lost is officially recognized as the national anthem of Poland.

I am informed by the consul from Czechoslovakia in New York that they have two national anthems, one for the Bohemian population of Czechoslovakia and one for the land that has been given them under the treaty of Versailles. I should like to have that letter in the record.

The letter is as follows:

DECEMBER 31, 1923.

HON. EMANUEL CELLER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: In reply to your inquiry of December 21, sent to me under the address of the Czechoslovak Legation, please be

advised that in the Czechoslovak Republic two songs are recognized as national anthems; one of them Kde domov můj has a Bohemian text and the other Nad Tatrou so blýska has Slovak words. Both are being played at official occasions, the anthem Kde domov můj being in precedence. There is, however, no legislative provision concerning same.

Very respectfully yours,

B. BARTOSORY, Consul.

With reference to England, I am informed that "God Save the King" is the available national anthem for England.

The letter I received from the consul general is as follows:

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: In reply to your letter of the 21st of December, which has been referred to us by the British Embassy, we desire to say that the national anthem is God Save the King, the words of which will be readily available in the Library of Congress, and the tune of which is the same as that to which the hymn My Country 'Tis of Thee is sung in the United States.

The usage of national anthem appears to be of comparatively recent growth. In the case of Great Britain it has not received legislative sanction by act of Parliament, but receives an official status in the King's regulations, which are issued by virtue of various acts of Parliament. The King's regulations are doubtless available at the Library of Congress, and full particulars of the official requirements with respect to the national anthem can be found in paragraphs 1776 and 1777. Regulation No. 1118 fixes the authorized arrangement and the tempo.

The playing of the national anthem on special occasions, irrespective of the presence of the sovereign, and the respect paid to it are purely a matter of custom.

Several of the great Dominions have anthems which are recognized as local national anthems; for example, The Maple Leaf Forever in Canada, and the Volkslied in the Transvaal. So far as we know, however, these have no legislative status. They do not supersede God Save the King.

If you desire, we shall be very glad to make further inquiries in London on this question.

Believe me, dear Mr. Congressman,

Very truly yours,

So that with reference to England, although they have no legislative enactment by Parliament, yet they have something which is very much akin to it, because the King, under authority given to him by an act of Parliament with the right to promulgate such a regulation, has already done so.

Mr. SUMNERS. Are you sure about that, that the act of Parliament has given the King the right to promulgate that regulation, which carries with it the force of law?

Mr. CELLER. Yes. The letter of the consul general says:

"In the case of Great Britain, it has not received legislative sanction by act of Parliament, but receives an official status in the King's regulations, which are issued by virtue of various acts of Parliament."

Of course, Mr. LINTHICUM has adverted to the fact that the Army and the Navy have already adopted the Star-Spangled Banner as their national anthem, and there is some significant language used in the Army and Navy Regulations.

Mr. HERSEY. Did the Army adopt that as part of the regulations?

Mr. CELLER. Yes. I received a letter from the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War to that effect, giving the chapter and page of the Army and Navy Regulations.

There is very significant language in the Navy Regulations to the effect that not only shall the Star-Spangled Banner be deemed the national anthem but it shall be deemed such to the exclusion of all national airs.

Mr. HERSEY. That is, they dispense with the singing of "America"?

Mr. CELLER. I presume that is what is meant by that. Of course, there is very good reason for that, as was pointed out in the letter of the British consul general. "America," of course, has the music of "God Save the King." If, for example, you were in London and you asked them to play the American national anthem and they played "America," of course all the British marines and soldiers and sailors would stand at attention, because they would think that what was being played was the British national anthem.

That confusion should be avoided. That is one reason, at least, why there has never been any action taken to adopt "America" as our nation anthem, because it would tend to create that confusion.

Mr. SUMNERS. If the Army and the Navy have adopted the Star-Spangled Banner as the national anthem and the public attitude in America leans toward that song, why, in your judgment, the necessity for the adoption of either of these propositions?

Mr. CELLER. Your question is well taken, and I think the answer lies in the fact that there should be some impetus given to the anthem by our National Legislature, by you and by me, who, I presume, are men of considerable influence in our communities. If, for example, it is generally known that the Congress of the United States has

stamped its approval upon the Star-Spangled Banner, there would be no question about it and there will be more and more people singing it.

Lots of people, it is charged, do not know the words of the Star-Spangled Banner. President Harding, in his wisdom, before the National Flag Conference, said that he would like to see everybody know the words and learn the music of the Star-Spangled Banner.

But that is a fallacy to my mind. If you are in any assembly and they play the Star-Spangled Banner, I am sure that 9 out of every 10 persons can sing it. I am sure you can sing the first verse if you can not sing the fourth.

Mr. HERSEY. Are you speaking to Judge SUMNERS?

Mr. CELLER. I am speaking to all of you. I think you can all sing it, as a matter of fact, despite any doubts to the contrary.

The CHAIRMAN. I shall have to rule, as a matter of order, that they shall not attempt to sing it here. [Laughter.]

Mr. SUMNERS. Right on that point, the history of this matter, of course, appeals to us all; that is, the place that the national anthem plays in the life of the people appeals to us all. But I never have been so sure and I am becoming less sure of the wisdom of undertaking to give direction to the drift of public opinion by legislation rather than have that drift come up naturally. That is the thing in my mind.

Mr. CELLER. That leads us to several schools of thought. There are some who say that the legislature should be in advance of public opinion. Others say that legislation should follow public opinion. I do not want to enter into a controversy with you on that score, and I think I know your views on the subject, because I have discussed them with you, Judge. But I think the situation is a whole lot different here. I think we must be actuated by patriotic motives and try to instill in the hearts of the people some idea of—not the necessity, but of the benefits to be accrued from the widespread use of this song.

Mr. SUMNERS. The idea of a governmental guardianship of the people everywhere and all the time may not be involved here, but it is a thing that disturbs me.

Mr. CELLER. I must perforce differ with you on whether or not we are drifting into a paternalistic form of government or otherwise. I do not think we ought to enter into that debate here at this present time.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We are not drifting; we have arrived.

Mr. CELLER. I think we have gone beyond the arrival. I think we have been into it for a long while, and I am inclined to agree that we may have been going too far, but I hope you are not going to call a halt at this particular time.

Mr. SUMNERS. Here is what I have in mind. Let us take a concrete situation. Suppose in a given community there live 10 people, and 8 of those people recognize the desirability of singing this song on some patriotic occasions. Two have not yet agreed, but they may soon come to agreement, because it is pretty hard for two to stand out against eight in a community. But when you enact legislation which carries persuasive force, if I may use that expression, do you think those two will come around quicker with that sort of an act than if you let them ease along a bit?

Mr. CELLER. I would rather let them ease along a bit, but your proposition could apply to every bit of legislation. I, for example, do not believe in prohibition, but I must abide by it because it is the will of the majority. Every law will find some people who are opposed to it, but they must bow down to the greatest number—"The greatest good for the greatest number," as Prof. William James, of Harvard, so succinctly stated.

Mr. SUMNERS. I am trying to get your views on that point, because I think that is the point the committee will consider.

Mr. CELLER. It is well worth considering.

Mr. SUMNERS. I am not antagonistic on that proposition. I am trying to bring you out on that point.

Mr. CELLER. We have jogged along for a century and most people want this song. I am sure they do. I have letters here from all over the country, from all kinds of organizations.

Mr. SUMNERS. There is nothing to keep them from singing it. I want you to bear in mind I am not opposed to your position. But the Army and Navy have it. The Navy keeps you out of difficulty and the Army keeps you out of difficulty through their adoption of it in the case which you cited; that is, the possibility of confusion in foreign countries. Folks sing it whenever they get ready in the country.

Mr. CELLER. I pointed out to you a number of cases which have been typical here of some musical conductors refusing to play it. If we enact this, they are running up against something which is stronger than they ran up against before, and I do not think they would dare to refuse to play it or sing it.

Mr. SUMNERS. Do you think it is stronger than public opinion? This can not penalize anybody.

Mr. CELLER. No; it can not; but I think it will solidify public opinion, which is somewhat scattered at the present time. It was for that reason that the bill has been introduced.

The CHAIRMAN. May I ask a question without interrupting your argument?

Mr. CELLER. Certainly, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Simply calling your attention to some of the communications that have come to our committee, one from an estimable lady, with a patriotic purpose, who says that the third stanza of this poem is a hymn of hate. I will read it:

And where is that band who so vauntingly swore
That the havoc of war and the battle's confusion
A home and a country should leave us no more?
Their blood has wash'd out their foul footsteps' pollution.
No refuge could save the hireling and slave
From the terror of flight or the gloom of the grave,
And the Star-Spangled Banner in triumph doth wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Mr. CELLER. I think I know the lady you speak of.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not care anything about that. I am merely pointing out to you her point of view.

Mr. CELLER. I know her objection, and I do not think, Mr. Chairman, her objection is well taken. This song was written in 1814, when our country was in her greatest peril.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; I understand.

Mr. CELLER. If you, for example, were gifted—and I presume you might be—with patriotic inspiration and you would write a song against Germany during the war, you would use words of similar import, if not the same.

The CHAIRMAN. The objection is that this language is not calculated to promote an harmonious and good feeling between two countries who are approaching each other and whose usefulness together will be so much greater than their singleness. That is the point.

Mr. CELLER. I know that point and know the force of her argument, and I say that her difficulties are more imaginary than real, and why?

That song was aimed at England a century ago; but it does not necessarily follow, with the history of the song and with the history of our own country, that those words to-day have the same connotations and the same meanings and associations they had a century ago.

There have clustered around that song and there are attached to it entirely different associations. They do not mean any particular foe. "The foul footsteps' pollution" are not Albion's now. What was particular then is only general now, and for that reason nothing now is aimed at England at all.

I would be the last person to do anything that would mar our friendly relations by the adoption of a national song which would have for its purpose something derogatory of England.

But I do not think it has that purpose. It is entirely changed, and I think the lady is quite mistaken with reference to the present import of those words.

The CHAIRMAN. You believe now that this has become a patriotic allusion to any foe that may attack the welfare of our country?

Mr. CELLER. Correct.

The CHAIRMAN. And that their footsteps would be the ones that are being wiped out in this section?

Mr. CELLER. You have got my answer to it correctly, sir.

Mr. BOIES. Let me ask you this question: If the liberty-loving people of this country can stand for any country adopting a national anthem which sings to the Almighty the same hymn we do here, the English can stand for this national anthem?

Mr. CELLER. I think so.

The CHAIRMAN. You understand, I am only calling your attention to this communication, so that you may say what you have already said about it.

Mr. CELLER. I am glad you reminded me of it, because I intended to revert to it, and I might have forgotten.

Mr. SUMNERS. May I ask you a question? You said if we had written this song during the war with Germany, we might have put such language as this in it. Suppose we had written it and 25 years afterwards we go over to Germany, after we have become peaceful with Germany. Our band would play that song and our musicians would sing that song in Germany. Do you think possibly they might not appreciate the fact that we were using what you call patriotic language?

Mr. CELLER. I suppose after 25 years the memories would still be fresh, but after—

Mr. SUMNERS (Interposing). One hundred years.

The CHAIRMAN. One hundred and fifty years.

Mr. CELLER. I do not think we can say those words mean or convey a feeling of hatred and venom against England. If you examine any patriotic song, it has similar words. If you examine the words of numerous national anthems, they speak of venom and hatred against enemies and those who are attacking its land and its sovereignty.

All patriotic songs are born of some mighty endeavor.

Mr. YATES. It is true, is it not, Mr. CELLER, that the British national anthem mentions the enemies of the country? It is true, isn't it, that there is a verse in the national anthem of Great Britain, which reads:

O, Lord, our God, arise,
Scatter his enemies,
And make them fall.
Confound their politics,
Frustrate their knavish tricks,
On thee our hopes we fix,
God save the King.

Mr. CELLER. The Britannia Ruling the Waves, which is a national song in England, is the acme of self-aggrandizement and says anathema to its enemies.

You will find that situation in every country and I do not think Miss Kitty Cheatham, who, I think, wrote that letter, or Mrs. Stetson, is wholly right or is following the right track.

As to the origin of the song, I do think, from what I can gather from data and from a very interesting book on the subject which I got from the Congressional Library, written by Oscar G. T. Sonneck, that the music was written by John Stafford Smith. The music comes from an old English song, a very ancient English song, To Anacreon in Heaven, a song which became very popular during our colonial period.

The CHAIRMAN. Some people say it was a barroom ballad.

Mr. CELLER. To Anacreon in Heaven speaks of Bacchus and Venus. These same people voice this objection you adverted to, and say, "Why should we have a song which will pollute the minds of little children when they sing it? There will be aroused in their minds the idea of Venus and Bacchus, and the old gods and demigods of the old Grecian days, because the song harks back to an old drinking-bout song of some roustabouts in London of the Anacreon Club."

But that, of course, is far-fetched, and, as a matter of fact, we are told by a great many musicians there are no original melodies. Every melody can be traced to some other melody, and if we are going to yield to that absurd argument, we will probably find even America or our favorite church hymn can be traced to some roustabout songs. I do not think there is anything to it, because it is so far-fetched.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not think so, either.

Mr. BOIES. Isn't it a fact that the churches some years ago came to the conclusion that the devil had the best tunes and they have adopted some of them?

Mr. CELLER. There isn't any question about that. To carry that out a little further, I will read to the gentleman the lines of the old English song, To Anacreon in Heaven, set in juxtaposition to lines of the Star-Spangled Banner, and you will see the exact similarity in rhythm and meter:

"To Anacreon in heaven, where he sat in full glee;
Here is the first line of the Star-Spangled Banner:
Oh say can you see by the dawn's early light,
A few sons of harmony sent a petition.
What so proudly we hail'd at the twilight's last gleaming,
That he their inspirer and patron would be.
Whose broad stripes and bright stars through the perilous fight,
When this answer arrived from the jolly old Grecian.
O'er the ramparts we watched were so gallantly streaming.
Voice, fiddle, and flute, no longer be mute.
And the rocket's red glare, the bombs bursting in air.
I herewith set forth the first verse of each song:

TO ANACREON IN HEAVEN

To Anacreon in heaven, where he sat in full glee,
A few sons of Harmony sent a petition,
That he their inspirer and patron would be,
When this answer arrived from the jolly old Grecian:
"Voice, fiddle, and flute,
"No longer be mute,
"I'll lend ye my name and inspire ye to boot;
"And, besides, I'll instruct you, like me, to entwine
"The myrtle of Venus with Bacchus's vine."

THE STAR-SPANGLED BANNER

O say, can you see by the dawn's early light,
What so proudly we hailed at the twilight's last gleaming?
Whose broad stripes and bright stars through the perilous flight,
O'er the ramparts we watched, were so gallantly streaming!
And the rocket's red glare,
The bombs bursting in air,
Gave proof through the night that our flag was still there;
O say, does that Star-Spangled Banner yet wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave?

In the sweep of the words and rhythm and meter of the two songs there is an exactitude that is unmistakable.

I was going to say before, this song, To Anacreon in Heaven, had a great vogue during the colonial period, so much so that we are told, for example, Thomas Paine had written a poem called "Adams and Liberty" and set his words in that poem to this very same music which we now sing in the Star-Spangled Banner.

In conclusion, I simply want to state, whenever you see the flag you always speak of the Star-Spangled Banner. The very name of the anthem is the name of our flag. We have taken from the anthem itself the words "Stars and Stripes." They are inseparable. When you see one you hear the words and the music of the other. The song is sung at all occasions—at the grave, in camp, on ship, in the lodge room, in the church, in the schoolroom; whenever there is some patriotic inspiration its inception always is in the Star-Spangled Banner.

Mr. HERSEY. Do you think that if we should adopt this bill or resolution making this the national anthem that it would detract anything from the flag?

Mr. CELLER. I do not think it would detract from the flag.

Mr. HERSEY. Would it add anything to the flag?

Mr. CELLER. No; it would not add anything to the flag. I simply tried to show by a few words that the terminology of the flag to a great extent has really come from the Star-Spangled Banner.

Mr. HERSEY. I want your opinion on another point. This is a military anthem, of course?

Mr. CELLER. I should say it would be; yes.

Mr. HERSEY. In the age in which we live, striving for peace with all nations and peoples and among ourselves, do you think it is exactly proper to adopt a national anthem which is a military anthem?

Mr. CELLER. It is not military in that sense. It is not military in the sense that it arouses military furies or military passions. Every song of patriotic spirit is military.

Mr. HERSEY. Oh, no.

Mr. CELLER. Every national anthem is military in a way.

Mr. HERSEY. You mean of other nations?

Mr. CELLER. Yes.

Mr. HERSEY. That is no reason why we should adopt a military anthem.

Mr. CELLER. I do not for one moment imagine that if a child were to sing the Star-Spangled Banner there would be aroused in its mind feelings or passion akin to war.

Mr. HERSEY. I just want your views.

Mr. CELLER. I do not think it would have that effect. There have been a great many other songs. For example, we know "Dixie" was a national air in a way, but it is too sectional to adopt. During the Spanish-American War we had "There will be a hot time in the old town to-night." That seemed to have died by the wayside.

During the World War we had "Over there," but that was only ephemeral and lasted for a short period of time. But somehow or other this song simply endures. It is deathless. It keeps on and on and on, and I am sure that we would do well by giving it official recognition as our national anthem.

To conclude: I have communications of indorsement of my resolution from these national organizations: The American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans of the World War, Daughters of the American Revolution, Sons of the American Revolution, Daughters of the War of 1812, as well as letters of approval from State chapters, posts, and departments of these national societies.

COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PAYMENT OF MONEY TO TWO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I call up privileged House Resolution 251.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York calls up the privileged resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 251

Resolved, That the select committee appointed under the provisions of H. Res. 217, adopted March 12, 1924, to investigate the allegations of a grand jury of the district court for the northern district of Illinois, southern division, that certain evidence has been submitted to them involving the payment of money to two Members of Congress, is hereby authorized to expend for stenographic, legal, and clerical assistance as it may deem necessary, in addition to the moneys already appropriated, the sum of \$10,000, which shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives on vouchers ordered by said committee, signed by the chairman of said select committee, and approved by the Committee on Accounts, evidenced by the signature of the chairman thereof.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 9, after the word "appropriated," insert the words "not exceeding."

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACGREGOR. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. On this committee there are some of the strongest lawyers in this House. The gentleman from New York is one of the best business men of this House. I am appealing to him to tell me why it is necessary to appropriate \$10,000 for them to employ legal services?

Mr. MACGREGOR. This committee is not employing any lawyer, and according to our information by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], it is not the intention to employ a lawyer.

Mr. BLANTON. Then why put in the word "legal"?

Mr. MACGREGOR. We did not want to deny them the right if they thought it necessary.

Mr. BLANTON. Surely the committee will not employ a lawyer. Will not the gentleman be willing to take the word "legal" out of the resolution?

Mr. MACGREGOR. I do not think we ought to limit the committee on the proposition.

Mr. BLANTON. Just such resolutions as this are costing the Government thousands of dollars every year.

Mr. MACGREGOR. I think this committee will not go beyond what is absolutely necessary.

Mr. BLANTON. All of this money that is expended has to be raised in taxes.

Mr. BURTON. If the gentleman from New York will yield, we have a secretary who is a young lawyer but is not engaged to do legal work except to subpoena witnesses. If that word "legal" was cut out we might have to dispense with his services. It is not the intention to employ legal assistance.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

JOURNAL OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 1836

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing an extract from the American Historical Review of April 3, 1924, relating to the Journals of the House of Representatives of 1836. They are of great interest to the students of the Journal and perhaps to the parliamentarians of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record I include the following:

[Reprinted from The American Historical Review, Vol. XXIX, No. 3, April, 1924]

3. ON THE JOURNALS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 1836

The following two letters, addressed to James K. Polk, as Speaker of the Twenty-fourth Congress, and preserved in volume 22 of the Polk Papers in the Library of Congress, were brought to the editor's attention by Prof. John S. Bassett. It is thought that they will be of interest to students of the House Journals. The occasion which elicited the letters can be understood by examining the Journal for June 13 and 15, 1836, and the Register of Debates for the same days. On June 13, the House having taken up the bill for the admission of Arkansas, John Quincy Adams moved an amendment, Sherred Williams, of Kentucky, moved the previous question.

"Mr. Adams objected to the right of Mr. Williams to the floor on the ground that he [Adams] had not yielded the floor after having submitted his motion to amend, but had remained standing whilst the Clerk was reading his amendment."

The Speaker ruled against him and was sustained by the House. On June 15 Adams sought to amend the Journal in respect of the passage just quoted, but was overruled by the House. Adams in his Memoirs, IX, 296, relates the matter thus:

"Fifteenth. I obtained a copy of the original draft of the Journal of the day before yesterday, with the erasures and alterations in it, and after the reading this morning of the Journal of yesterday I moved that the Journal of the day before be made to read as it had already been drawn up by the assistant clerk. This occasioned a debate of an hour, * * * and my amendment was rejected by yeas and nays."

Col. Walter S. Franklin was Clerk of the House of Representatives from 1833 to his death in 1838. Samuel Burch, whom Adams (X, 45) speaks of as "the most efficient clerk in the office," had been there

since 1805 at least (Journal, April 17, 1806), and was now assistant clerk of the House. In the Works of James Buchanan (III, 194), appended to Buchanan's speech on the expunging resolution, is a letter from Burch to Franklin, April 6, 1836, stating that, from the first days of the House until 1823, the "rough journal" had not been preserved after the printed version had been made, though a manuscript journal was made up by copying from the printed text; but that from 1823 on he had caused the "rough journal" to be preserved and bound in volumes.

WALTER S. FRANKLIN TO JAMES K. POLK

OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, June 15, 1836.

SIR: Mr. Adams having on yesterday stated that he intended making some motion in relation to the Journal of Monday last (June 13), it becomes me to state the usual practice in making up the Journal of the day.

Mr. Burch, the journalizing clerk, makes up the Journal from my minutes and submits it to me before handing it to the Speaker for his correction. I make such alterations in it as are necessary or as suggest themselves to me as proper, after which it is, agreeably to the rule of the House, handed to the Speaker for his correction.

Erasures and interlineations are invariably made when the first draft of the Journal as written out by Mr. Burch is altered either by the Speaker or myself before it is read to the House, and scarcely a Journal is made up and read to the House that does not contain them. It would be impossible to have a fair copy of it made between the time it is submitted to the Speaker and the meeting of the House, and, of course, the Journal read in the House is the one approved of by the House, and from which the Journal of the House is printed.

In relation to the Journal of Monday, Mr. Burch wrote the first draft of the Journal and submitted it to the Speaker. The Speaker sent for me, and after consultation as to the best mode of expression to be used in relation to the fact, it was concluded that the mode made use of in the paragraph referred to by Mr. Adams, as read in the House, was the best, and adopted accordingly.

The Journal of that day was made up and corrected in the way that it has always been done since I have had the direction of it, and as it now stands was read to the House.

Your obedient servant,

W. S. FRANKLIN,

Clerk House of Representatives of United States.

SAMUEL BURCH TO J. K. POLK

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, June 15, 1836.

SIR: In compliance with your desire expressed to me this morning, I give you the following statement:

I have exclusively made up the Journals of the House of Representatives of the United States for the last 23 years, and occasionally before that time. I write it up from the short minutes, (which are a species of shorthand) taken at the table and from the papers which come before the House.

In fulfilling this duty it necessarily often, indeed daily, happens that I have, upon revising and comparing, to erase lines and sometimes whole entries. Changes are occasionally made by the Clerk, where (not being usually in the House) I have mistaken the course of proceeding. The rules require the Speaker to examine and correct the Journal daily before it is read in the House. I submit it to him every morning. He examines it with care, and if he discovers anything on it which he deems proper to have changed or corrected, the changes or corrections are made. All the alterations which are made appear on the face of the paper.

It is the original rough draft which is read in the House, and is preserved. It can not be examined until within a few minutes of the hour of meeting; it is therefore wholly impossible to copy it before it is time to read it in the House; a dozen clerks could not do it, and, indeed, I think it proper that the original draft should be the official draft.

I speak advisedly when I say that from the commencement of the Government it has been the practice to make the alterations on the face of the paper and that the original rough draft is the one which has been always read to the House; and I will further state that my drafts of late years are much more perfect and contain less alterations than those of former days.

During the present session, in consequence of the fact of the Journal seeming to excite more attention on the part of the Speaker and Members than usual, I have been more than usually careful in constructing the entries. I frequently write them fuller than I deem necessary or even proper, as in making alterations or corrections it is much easier to erase than to insert. This was the case.

with respect to the entry about Mr. Adams's appeal on Monday last. That paragraph now stands as, upon advisement, it was supposed to contain a more explicit statement of fact than as originally drawn out by me, having placed in it remarks which it was supposed a Journal of proceedings had nothing to do with.

S. BURCH.

NORMAN E. IVES

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I call up a privileged resolution, House Resolution 152.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 152

Resolved, That there be paid out of the contingent fund of the House \$1,200 to Norman E. Ives, for extra and expert services to the Committee on Invalid Pensions from September 23, 1922, to December 3, 1923, including the second and third sessions of the Sixty-seventh Congress, as assistant clerk to said committee, by detail from the Bureau of Pensions, pursuant to law.

The resolution was agreed to.

WALTER C. NEILSON

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 148, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 148

Resolved, That there be paid out of the contingent fund of the House \$1,200 to Walter C. Neilson for extra and expert services to the Committee on Pensions from September 12, 1922, to December 3, 1923, and during the second, third, and fourth sessions of the Sixty-seventh Congress and to December 3, 1923, as the examiner to said committee, by detail from the Bureau of Pensions, pursuant to law.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Welch, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 1932. An act to change the name of Thirty-seventh Street between Chevy Chase Circle and Reno Road;

S. 2357. An act for the relief of the Pacific Commissary Co.;

S. 1974. An act providing for sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment;

S. J. Res. 64. Joint resolution to change the name of Mount Rainier to Mount Tacoma, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 104. Joint resolution requesting the President to invite the Interparliamentary Union to hold its annual meeting for the year 1925 in the city of Washington and authorizing an appropriation to meet the expenses of the assembly.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 7

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the bill (H. R. 6715) to reduce and equalize taxation, to provide revenue, and for other purposes, as reported to the Senate, be printed as a Senate document, together with an index thereof and the report to the Senate made in connection therewith, and the three amendments offered by the minority, and that 2,500 additional copies be printed, of which 500 shall be for the Senate document room, 1,000 for the House document room, 800 for the Committee on Finance of the Senate, and 200 for the Committee on Ways and Means of the House.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 3761. An act for the relief of George A. Nickles;

H. J. Res. 222. Joint resolution granting permission to Hugh S. Cumming, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, to accept certain decorations bestowed upon him by the Republics of France and Poland; and

H. J. Res. 247. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal years 1924 and 1925.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment the following resolution, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. J. Res. 163. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to loan certain tents, cots, and chairs to the executive committee of the United Confederate Veterans for use at the thirty-fourth annual reunion to be held at Memphis, Tenn., in June, 1924.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bills and joint resolutions of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 2357. An act for the relief of the Pacific Commissary Co.; to the Committee on War Claims.

S. 1974. An act providing for sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. J. Res. 64. Joint resolution to change the name of Mount Rainier to Mount Tacoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. J. Res. 104. Joint resolution requesting the President to invite the Interparliamentary Union to hold its annual meeting for the year 1925 in the city of Washington and authorizing an appropriation to meet the expenses of the assembly; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 7

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the bill (H. R. 6715) to reduce and equalize taxation, to provide revenue, and for other purposes, as reported to the Senate, be printed as a Senate document, together with an index thereof and the report to the Senate made in connection therewith, and the three amendments offered by the minority, and that 2,500 additional copies be printed, of which 500 shall be for the Senate document room, 1,000 for the House document room, 800 for the Committee on Finance of the Senate, and 200 for the Committee on Ways and Means of the House.

To the Committee on Printing.

EXTERMINATION OF INSECTS, MICE, ETC., IN CAPITOL

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Concurrent Resolution No. 19, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 19

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Architect of the Capitol be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to make a contract for the extermination and banishment of insects, mice, and rats from the House Office Building, the Capitol, and the Senate Office Building at an expenditure not to exceed \$4,500. That the expenditures in carrying out the contract be paid from the contingent funds of the House and Senate in equal proportions and upon vouchers authorized by the respective committees having control of the contingent funds of the Senate and House of Representatives and approved by the chairman thereof.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that this concurrent resolution is not privileged, coming from the Committee on Accounts. That committee has privilege concerning only our own contingent fund.

Mr. MACGREGOR. I do not know whether that is so or not, but does not the gentleman want to exterminate these cockroaches and things?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I am objecting to this annual appropriation of \$4,000.

Mr. MACGREGOR. What is the gentleman going to do with them?

Mr. BLANTON. That is a rather large sum.

Mr. MACGREGOR. But this is divided up.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Has the committee any notion of the population of these insects?

The SPEAKER. The Committee on Accounts is privileged to report resolutions concerning the contingent fund of the House only, the Chair thinks.

Mr. BLANTON. I hope the gentleman will not call this resolution up at this time.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Very well, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York withdraws the resolution.

AIR SERVICE INVESTIGATION

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 243, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 243.

Resolved, That the select committee appointed under the provisions of House Resolution 192, adopted March 24, 1924, to make inquiry into the operations of the United States Army Air Service, United States Naval Bureau of Aeronautics, United States Mail Air Service, or any agency, branch, or subsidiary of either, is hereby authorized to employ such stenographic, legal, and clerical assistance, including accountants and statisticians, as it may deem necessary, and is further authorized to have such printing and binding done as it may require.

Resolved further, That all expenses incurred by said committee under the provisions of House Resolution 192, including the expenses of such committee or any subcommittee thereof when sitting outside of the District of Columbia, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives on vouchers, ordered by said committee,

signed by the chairman of said select committee, or by the chairman of a subcommittee where such expenses are incurred by such subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on Accounts, evidenced by the signature of the chairman thereof.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, after the word "Columbia," insert the words "not exceeding \$25,000."

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. UNDERHILL offers an amendment to the committee amendment, as follows: Strike out "\$25,000" in the committee amendment and insert "\$15,000."

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, my purpose in offering this amendment is twofold. One is to call to the attention of the House that when we vote unanimously for investigating committees we seldom take into consideration the amount of money of the taxpayers that is to be spent on the investigation and the lack of results which usually follows. This particular investigation is for the Air Service. Within the last three or four years we have had four investigations of similar character, and all of the data that has been collected by these various committees is at the disposal of the House, for the information of any of its Members. This is only one of some four or five or six investigating committees for which the House has appropriated amounts ranging from \$11,000 to \$25,000. I call attention to the fact that a few days ago we appropriated \$25,000 for an investigation of the Shipping Board, and that less than three years ago we had a very exhaustive investigation of the Shipping Board which cost something like \$42,000, at which time recommendations were made both to the Shipping Board and to the House of Representatives for reforms which never have been adopted by either the House or the Shipping Board. It is a duplication of work which has grown enormously even in the short time I have been a Member of the House. I think something should be done to put a stop to it. Consequently, I am offering this amendment lowering the amount from \$25,000 to \$15,000, with the expectation that this committee when they have spent \$15,000 will come back to the Committee on Accounts and tell us what they have accomplished. Then if they have not accomplished anything I think the Committee on Accounts will be justified, and the House will uphold them, in refusing further appropriations. On the other hand, if they bring in any information which is of service and value in the saving of money to the Treasury, the Committee on Accounts would not think of limiting or hampering them by refusing the appropriation. As a matter of fact, the amount should be less than \$15,000 in all of these cases, and in some of them we have made it less than \$15,000 with that idea in view, but because we had established a temporary precedent in granting to the Shipping Board investigating committee \$25,000 the members of this committee, with whom I have no quarrel whatever, came before us and asked us for \$40,000, and we cut that down to \$25,000. It would be very much better if we would limit these amounts by action of the House to a specific certain sum, \$10,000, \$15,000, or even \$30,000 and then stick to that amount.

This resolution goes far afield. It allows this committee to sit during the recesses and such subcommittees thereof to sit outside of the District of Columbia. It is an unusual provision to allow this committee or subcommittee to travel throughout the length and breadth of this country to spend whatever money they want to—legitimately, I assume, and I am not casting any reflections upon the committee or upon its chairman or the personnel of the committee. However, I think we ought to have an established policy, and I trust that the offering of this amendment will result in making these committees seek in the first place \$15,000, with the idea that later on they shall come before this Committee on Accounts and show results if they can, when they may secure further appropriations. I hope the amendment will prevail.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON].

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I hope this limitation will not be approved.

Personally I have no other interest in this matter as the proponent of the resolution than to serve the country. If the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL] knew what my purpose is, I am sure that he would not try to hamstring the investigating committee, although I think the gentleman has been opposed to anything being done from the beginning.

Let me just present to you the larger and then briefly touch upon the more limited view. We are appropriating, I am told by a good authority, something more than \$60,000,000 a year for the Air Service. We, the trusted representatives of the people's purse, blindly, as it were, through the Committee on Appropriations, appropriate these large sums of money every year. I am not criticizing the Committee on Appropriations. Members on that committee have a large field to investigate; they make inquiries, but they can not know in detail the use to which these moneys are put. We are very busy on the appropriating end of the matter, but we do not function when we come to looking into the expenditures.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. If I have five minutes more.

Mr. MACGREGOR. I do not think this ought to be unduly prolonged.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. I want to answer any questions, but I would like to have five minutes without interruption.

Mr. UNDERHILL. If the gentleman will just answer one question. Every appropriation that we make for every department is subject to the point which the gentleman makes, that we ought to provide an investigating committee to find out how the money is being spent which we appropriate.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. If there is any reform in the rules to which I am going to devote myself, it is to make the expenditure committees as important as the appropriating committees in this House, so that the expenditure committees will find out what the administrative officials are doing with these funds, and not simply appropriate without looking into what we are getting out of the moneys that we appropriate.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. Is there any reason why the gentleman after he has used \$15,000 could not come back and make such a showing as to get the other part?

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Yes; there is reason—

Mr. BEGG. One other thing, and the gentleman can answer both. Will the gentleman tell us what he is going to do with the whole \$25,000, not in detail?

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Gentlemen, I have had several experiences with resolutions of this kind. It is the hardest thing in the world to undertake to get a resolution through this House to find out what we do with the people's money. First, you have to run the gauntlet of the Committee on Rules, the steering committee, and the other powers that be, and then of the House itself. Then you have to go to the Committee on Accounts to get the means to employ clerical and expert help, for members of the committee have not the time, and it takes all of a man's time to do these things. To get a resolution through the Committee on Accounts is not an easy matter because the committee is busy and it is difficult frequently to get a quorum of its Members to attend. You will have two or three meetings to explain over and over, which makes it such a tremendous job. I wish, therefore, to avoid this burden; and also to be able to plan better for the investigation.

Now, briefly, I have made two different speeches on this subject. I do not wish to take up your time to go over these matters again, and I have not time anyway in five minutes to explain, but here we have three air services, one in the Navy, and one in the Army, and one as to the Post Office Department. These are all of growing importance; we should coordinate them, we should see to it that commercially they are successful, and that for the purpose of defense they are trustworthy. Now, as the aftermath of the war, when we spent billions of dollars on the Air Service and got not one fighting plane in France, we have still bad conditions existing in these services. I have explained these heretofore fully. I am certain that the House, having authorized the investigation, will see that it is successful.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, we are fortunate in having the gentleman from Wisconsin at the head of this special select committee. He is not only an experienced successful attorney—

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. I am not on the committee. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. BLANTON. I thought the gentleman was. [Laughter.] Whenever I find a man asking for \$25,000 expense money I think he is chairman of a committee. [Laughter.]

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The other gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAMPERT] is the chairman.

Mr. BLANTON. But we ought to cut this down. What the gentleman said is true. If our 11 committees on expenditures

in the various departments would do their duty, we would not have to be creating special committees, with special dispensation, and special expense accounts. These committees on expenditures ought to get to work, and, Mr. Speaker, there is not a bit of sense on earth of allowing over \$10,000 to this committee, not a bit of sense in it. You are granting blanket authority to this committee to employ all the attorneys they want, all the statisticians they want, all the accountants they want, all the stenographers they want, and everything else they want, and it is too much money.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. And I am going to offer an amendment to cut it down, not only from \$25,000 to \$15,000, but to \$10,000. I offer an amendment to strike out \$15,000 and insert \$10,000.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I raise the point of order on the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. It is an amendment in the second degree.

Mr. BLANTON. It is an amendment to that amendment as a substitute, and is in order.

The SPEAKER. No substitute has been offered.

Mr. BLANTON. I offer it as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas offers a substitute, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL]: Strike out "\$15,000," and insert in lieu thereof "\$10,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute.

The question was taken, and the substitute was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL].

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the yeas seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—yeas 41, noes 26.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask for tellers. I make the point of order there is no quorum present, and I object to the vote on that account.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman withdraw his request for tellers?

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. I make the point of order that the point of order comes too late for a quorum to get a roll call. The gentleman having asked for tellers—

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not see why that is so and overrules the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. I mean to get a record vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not. The gentleman makes the point of order there is no quorum present. It is clear there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will bring in absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 104, nays 193, answered "present" 1, not voting 134, as follows:

YEAS—104

Aldrich	Denison	MacLafferty	Snyder
Allen	Evans, Iowa	Madden	Sprout, Ill.
Bacon	Fairchild	Magee, N. Y.	Sprout, Kans.
Beedy	Fleetwood	Manlove	Stalker
Begg	Frothingham	Mapes	Stephens
Black, Tex.	Fuller	Moore, Ind.	Strong, Kans.
Bland	Funk	Morehead	Summers, Wash.
Blanton	Gibson	Morris	Sumners, Tex.
Briggs	Gifford	Morrow	Taber
Browne, N. J.	Graham, Ill.	Nelson, Me.	Taylor, Tenn.
Browning	Greene, Mass.	Parker	Taylor, W. Va.
Buchanan	Hastings	Parks, Ark.	Thatcher
Burdick	Hersey	Purnell	Tillman
Burton	Hill, Md.	Rayburn	Tilson
Byrnes, Tenn.	Howard, Nebr.	Reece	Timberlake
Cable	Hudson	Roach	Tincher
Carter	Hull, Morton D.	Robison, Ky.	Tinkham
Chindblom	Johnson, Ky.	Rogers, Mass.	Treadway
Christopherson	Johnson, Tex.	Salmon	Underhill
Clarke, N. Y.	Johnson, W. Va.	Sanders, Tex.	Vincent, Mich.
Clary	Leatherwood	Scott	Vinson, Ky.
Cole, Iowa	Longworth	Seger	Williams, Mich.
Colton	Lowrey	Sherwood	Williamson
Cooper, Ohio	Luce	Simmons	Wingo
Cramton	McLaughlin, Mich.	Smith	Winslow
Dallinger	McReynolds	Snell	Woodrum

NAYS—193

Abernethy	Aswell	Barbour	Boies
Aligood	Ayres	Beck	Bowling
Almon	Bankhead	Berger	Box

Boyce	Garner, Tex.	Lindsay	Reed, N. Y.
Boylan	Garrett, Tenn.	Linthicum	Richards
Brand, Ga.	Garrett, Tex.	Little	Robinson, Iowa
Brand, Ohio	Gasque	Lozier	Romjue
Browne, Wis.	Gilbert	Lyon	Ruby
Buckley	Green, Iowa	McDuffie	Sabath
Burtness	Greenwood	McFadden	Sanders, Ind.
Busby	Griffin	McKenzie	Sandlin
Cannon	Hadley	McKeown	Schafer
Celler	Hammer	McSwain	Schneider
Clague	Hardy	McSweeney	Shallenberger
Clancy	Harrison	MacGregor	Sinclair
Collier	Hawley	Major, Ill.	Sinnott
Collins	Hayden	Major, Mo.	Smithwick
Connally, Tex.	Hickey	Martin	Speaks
Connelly	Hill, Ala.	Mead	Stegall
Cook	Hill, Wash.	Michener	Stedman
Cooper, Wis.	Holaday	Miller, Wash.	Stengle
Crisp	Hooker	Milligan	Stevenson
Crosser	Huddleston	Minahan	Swank
Crowther	Hudspeth	Montague	Swing
Cullen	Hull, Iowa	Moore, Ga.	Tague
Davey	Hull, William E.	Moore, Ohio	Thomas, Ky.
Davis, Minn.	Humphreys	Morgan	Thomas, Okla.
Davis, Tenn.	Jacobstein	Murphy	Tydings
Deal	James	Nelson, Wis.	Underwood
Dickinson, Iowa	Jeffers	Newton, Mo.	Upshaw
Dickinson, Mo.	Jones	O'Brien	Valle
Doughton	Kearns	O'Connell, N. Y.	Vinson, Ga.
Dowell	Keller	O'Connell, R. I.	Voigt
Driver	Ketcham	O'Sullivan	Wainwright
Dyer	Kincheloe	Oldfield	Watkins
Eagan	Kindred	Oliver, Ala.	Weaver
Elliott	King	Park, Ga.	Wefald
Evans, Mont.	Kopp	Peavey	White, Kans.
Fairfield	Kunz	Peery	Williams, Tex.
Faust	Kvale	Perkins	Wilson, Ind.
Favrot	LaGuardia	Pou	Wilson, La.
Fisher	Lampert	Quin	Wilson, Miss.
Frear	Lanham	Ragon	Winter
Freeman	Lankford	Rainey	Wolff
French	Larsen, Ga.	Raker	Wright
Fulbright	Lazaro	Ramsayer	Young
Fulmer	Lea, Calif.	Rankin	
Garber	Leavitt	Rathbone	
Gardner, Ind.	Lilly	Reed, Ark.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

White, Me.

NOT VOTING—134

Ackerman	Drewry	Lineberger	Rouse
Anderson	Edmonds	Logan	Sanders, N. Y.
Andrew	Fenn	McClintic	Schali
Anthony	Fish	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sears, Fla.
Arnold	Fitzgerald	McLeod	Sears, Nebr.
Bacharach	Foster	McNulty	Shreve
Barkley	Fredericks	Magee, Pa.	Sites
Beers	Free	Mansfield	Strong, Pa.
Bell	Gallivan	Merritt	Sullivan
Bixler	Geran	Michaelson	Sweet
Black, N. Y.	Glatfelter	Miller, Ill.	Swoope
Bloom	Goldsborough	Mills	Taylor, Colo.
Britten	Graham, Pa.	Mooney	Temple
Brumm	Griest	Moore, Ill.	Thompson
Bulwinkle	Haugen	Moore, Va.	Tucker
Butler	Hawes	Morin	Vare
Byrnes, S. C.	Hoch	Mudd	Vestal
Campbell	Howard, Okla.	Newton, Minn.	Ward, N. C.
Candfield	Hull, Tenn.	Nolan	Ward, N. Y.
Carew	Johnson, S. Dak.	O'Connor, La.	Wason
Casey	Johnson, Wash.	O'Connor, N. Y.	Watres
Clark, Fla.	Jost	Oliver, N. Y.	Watson
Cole, Ohio	Kahn	Paige	Weller
Connolly, Pa.	Kelly	Patterson	Welsh
Cornig	Kendall	Perlman	Wertz
Croll	Kent	Phillips	Williams, Ill.
Cummings	Kerr	Porter	Wood
Curry	Kless	Prall	Woodruff
Darrow	Knutson	Quayle	Wurzbach
Dempsey	Kurtz	Ransley	Wyant
Dickstein	Langley	Reed, W. Va.	Yates
Dominick	Larson, Minn.	Reid, Ill.	Zihlman
Doyle	Lee, Ga.	Rogers, N. H.	
Drane	Lehlbach	Rosenbloom	

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs: Until further notice:

Mr. Patterson with Mr. Draine.
 Mr. Wason with Mr. Rogers of New Hampshire.
 Mr. Langley with Mr. Clark of Florida.
 Mr. Vare with Mr. Byrnes of South Carolina.
 Mr. Michaelson with Mr. Gallivan.
 Mr. Wyant with Mr. McClintic.
 Mr. Williams of Illinois with Mr. Arnold.
 Mr. Vestal with Mr. Bulwinkle.
 Mr. Swoope with Mr. Barkley.
 Mr. Mills with Mr. Moore of Virginia.
 Mr. Porter with Mr. Carew.
 Mr. Ransley with Mr. Tucker.
 Mr. Johnson of South Dakota with Mr. Weller.
 Mr. Anthony with Mr. Hawes.
 Mr. Bacharach with Mr. Taylor of Colorado.
 Mr. Kendall with Mr. Mooney.
 Mr. McLeod with Mr. O'Connor of New York.
 Mr. Shreve with Mr. Ward of North Carolina.
 Mr. Wurtz with Mr. Kent.
 Mr. Reid of Illinois with Mr. Mansfield.
 Mr. Wurzbach with Mr. Oliver of New York.
 Mr. Magee of Pennsylvania with Mr. Cummings.
 Mr. Darrow with Mr. Casey.

Mr. Kiess with Mr. Sites.
 Mr. Ackerman with Mr. Howard of Oklahoma.
 Mr. Graham of Pennsylvania with Mr. Hull of Tennessee.
 Mr. Bixler with Mr. Dominick.
 Mr. Butler with Mr. Glatfelter.
 Mr. Fenn with Mr. O'Connor of Louisiana.
 Mr. Kurtz with Mr. Black of New York.
 Mr. Morin with Mr. Bloom.
 Mr. Beers with Mr. Quayle.
 Mr. Free with Mr. Geran.
 Mr. Johnson of Washington with Mr. Sullivan.
 Mr. Watson with Mr. Dickstein.
 Mr. Strong of Pennsylvania with Mr. Prall.
 Mr. Kahn with Mr. Sears of Florida.
 Mr. Griest with Mr. Drewry.
 Mr. Brumm with Mr. Goldsborough.
 Mr. Connolly of Pennsylvania with Mr. Croll.
 Mr. Edmonds with Mr. McNulty.
 Mr. Fish with Mr. Canfield.
 Mr. Phillips with Mr. Corning.
 Mr. Temple with Mr. Bell.
 Mr. Foster with Mr. Jost.
 Mr. Curry with Mr. Logan.
 Mr. Fitzgerald with Mr. Kerr.
 Mr. Lehlbach with Mr. Lee of Georgia.
 Mr. Perlman with Mr. Doyle.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7220, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL] will please resume the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7220, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes, with Mr. DOWELL in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7220, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7220) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For physical investigations of the important properties of soil which determine productivity, such as moisture relations, aerations, heat conductivity, texture, and other physical investigations of the various soil classes and soil types, \$13,145.

Mr. MOREHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MOREHEAD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, in the consideration of the agricultural bill, my home State being an agricultural State which but a few years since was considered as the "Great American Desert," I am reminded of the fact that to one man perhaps more than any other citizen, Nebraska has been remade and almost revolutionized in its changes. I want here to occupy just a few moments in paying my respects to one of the great citizens of our State, who not only took a great interest in the affairs of Nebraska, but took a great interest in national affairs. I refer to the Hon. J. Sterling Morton.

In my home State, Nebraska, to-day is Arbor Day, the birthday of J. Sterling Morton, the founder of Arbor Day, and a man closely connected with Nebraska's early history, but not unknown in other States; as almost without exception every State in the Union now has enacted laws relating to tree planting and has a day set aside for that purpose. In 1872, the first Arbor Day in Nebraska, one Lancaster farmer planted 10,000 trees. At that time many parts of Nebraska were absolutely treeless. To-day many of the smaller cities look like forests as the streets are lined with trees.

J. Sterling Morton was active in public affairs, holding many positions of trust in the State, and was Secretary of Agriculture

during President Cleveland's second administration. He opposed the distribution of free seeds, denouncing it as a graft and useless expense, and returned to the Treasury \$200,000 or 20 per cent of the total appropriation made by Congress for the Agriculture Department. It was also during his term that corn was introduced to the people of Europe.

There are many other things connecting J. Sterling Morton with Nebraska's early history, but I believe he himself considered the leaving to his State the heritage of trees his greatest achievement. It is well to recall his closing words in 1894 at the end of the tree-planting exercises in this city when he said:

So every man, woman, and child who plant trees shall be able to say, on coming as I have come, toward the evening of life, in all sincerity and truth, if you seek my monument look around you.

To-day J. Sterling Morton's home, Arbor Lodge and Morton Park, belongs to the State of Nebraska, presented by his son, Joy Morton. The old Morton homestead with all its grandeurs will be used for a museum of natural history and surrounding grounds for a State botanic garden; a State park for the pleasure of future generations and to the memory of one of Nebraska's most historic men. Truly Nebraska City may well be proud of so useful a citizen.

Lives of great men all remind us
 We can make our lives sublime,
 And departing, leave behind us
 Footprints on the sand of time.

And in this connection I repeat the lines of the old poem—

Woodman, spare that tree!
 Touch not a single bough!
 In youth it sheltered me,
 And I'll protect it now.

[Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, general expenses, \$301,600.
 Total, Bureau of Soils, \$391,600.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, out of order, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in the RECORD an amendment which I propose to offer to-morrow to the bill H. R. 4830.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an amendment to a bill, as indicated.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I did not hear any indication at all.

Mr. RAKER. My request is to have printed in the RECORD a proposed amendment to the bill H. R. 4830, which is going to be considered to-morrow. I wish to insert it for the benefit of the membership.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, I shall have to object to that. The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations of insects affecting southern field crops, including insects affecting cotton, tobacco, rice, sugar cane, etc., and the cigarette beetle and Argentine ant, \$206,920.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, in 1892 the cotton-boll weevil entered the United States, and thus began the greatest agricultural devastation in the history of this Government, if not in the history of the world.

If the financial losses involved in this great problem could be regarded as passed and we could look to the future with certainty of hope, I would not claim the attention of the House at this time. But when optimists are in doubt and admit that the peak of devastation has not been reached and that the end of the evil day can not be seen, it is time for conservatives to become alarmed.

I shall incorporate in my remarks a table compiled from data furnished by the Departments of Agriculture and Commerce, showing cotton acreage, production, and average price received by the producer from 1891, which marks the year preceding the advent of the weevil, to 1923, inclusive. I shall also incorporate statements showing cotton surplus from 1921 to 1923, inclusive,

and Federal appropriations for weevil infestation, and cotton production under boll-weevil conditions. But it is my purpose at this time to call attention to results for specific years within the period.

Cotton acreage for 1891, the year prior to the advent of the weevil, was 19,058,704 acres; our production of 9,018,000 bales. Our acreage for last year, 1923, was 38,287,000 acres, or more than twice that of 1891, yet latest available information discloses a yield little more than 10,000,000 bales. According to production for 1891, our yield for last year should have been 18,000,000 bales instead of 10,000,000.

For the 10-year period following weevil advent our average cotton harvest was 22,540,633 acres and our average yield was 9,038,540 bales. The average harvest for the past 10 years has been 34,413,400 acres, but still our average production is only 11,469,541 bales. These are actual results obtained with expert knowledge, increased fertilization, intensive cultivation, and so forth.

An analysis of these figures show that for the year preceding weevil advent, with one-half the acreage, our yield was practically as great as that produced last year. We then received an average price of 7.3 cents per pound and managed to exist. Latest available figures indicate that we have received an average price of 31 cents per pound for the 1923 crop, yet most of the growers in the weevil belt have "gone broke." For the five-year period following weevil advent our average harvest was 13,800,000 acres less than the average for the past five years, yet our production was practically the same. For the first five-year period the average price received was 9.62 cents, but for the last period of five years it has been 24.38 cents. The net results for the two periods show an annual loss of 13,000,000 acres of cultivated land, fertilized at a cost of about \$16,000,000 per annum. It shows a labor loss of 750,000 persons, a working force more than five times as great as our National Army. It also means a permanent investment loss of 750,000 farm animals, with feed and equipment for same.

With weevil infestation and known methods of control the present price for cotton can never be greatly reduced. High prices are made necessary not alone for cost of calcium arsenate poisoning, for its distribution, machinery, and so forth, but also on account of the high fertilization, intensive and prolonged cultivation, as well as for dependable and intelligent labor required for production under weevil conditions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. May I have eight minutes additional? I can finish in that time. The subject is rather important.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to proceed for eight minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Does the gentleman think that under normal conditions last year we could have produced 18,000,000 bales?

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. We should have.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Does the gentleman think it would be profitable for the South to produce 18,000,000 bales?

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Just at this time it might be, because the world's shortage is so great. Under ordinary conditions it would not be profitable.

The average farmer is not governed so much by acreage as he is by the amount of money needed for operation of business. Under weevil conditions large acreage is necessary to produce the amount of money which the farmer needs and the amount of cotton which the world must have. Demand for cotton will regulate the acreage to be planted under any conditions. Without the weevil we would only plant a sufficient acreage to produce the amount of cotton required. The acreage of cotton would be regulated by demand, just as the acreage of wheat, corn, and other commodities are now regulated. Without the weevil we would only plant sufficient lands in cotton to meet the world's demand for cotton, and surplus lands would be planted in other crops. The trouble is we are now planting twice the acreage to cotton that would be required without the weevil, and yet we are neither producing sufficient cotton for the world's needs or clearing enough money on the crop to meet necessary expenses.

For two generations the southern farmer, especially in the Cotton Belt, has endured hardships, occasioned first by Civil War and later by weevil infestation. He has never received subsidies or bounties from his Government and expects little

from that source. He is not inured to hardships, but has become accustomed to bear his burdens with little complaint. Again, as the spread of the weevil has been slow and gradual, the alarm to the country has not been so great as it might otherwise have been.

It is difficult to estimate in dollars just what damage the boll weevil has done, but, all told, the loss from infestation, and so forth, amounts to at least \$10,000,000,000. Conservative estimates place the annual loss at this time at \$500,000,000. At the present rate of damage the loss will soon amount to more than the national cost of the World War, and still the future will hold no more of promise than the past.

Who must pay these bills? The consumer, of course. He is now paying four times more for cotton than he did before the advent of the weevil. The schedule of prices incorporated in my remarks show that this increase has been gradual, but continuous and sure, since weevil infestation. If the American citizen understood the situation upon the principle of conservation and economy, instead of permitting an attempt at weevil control he would demand weevil eradication.

When the sea pirates destroyed our commerce and demanded tribute as a price for resistance the reply of our forefathers was—

Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute.

This slogan and spirit put an end to piracy and made our commerce forever free. With the same determination to-day and sufficient funds for eradication, instead of meager appropriations for control, the Nation might rid itself of this expensive weevil pest within five years. The amount expended would probably be saved to the consumer within that period, and large savings would thereafter result.

It is not my purpose to adversely criticize the Department of Agriculture or anyone, but I do desire to emphasize the fact that it is not my belief that demonstration methods for combating the weevil or any method of weevil control short of ultimate eradication are really worth while or are in keeping with the policy and progress of this Nation in dealing with a matter of such vital interest.

The Government has made appropriations as follows:

For weevil infestation, 1905 to 1924, inclusive.....	\$954,100
For production under weevil conditions, 1907 to 1924, inclusive.....	458,020
Total.....	1,412,120

These appropriations have been helpful. I am sure they have been deeply appreciated by the cotton growers of the South, but they have not met the demands of the situation. Weevil control will never solve the problem. Eradication is the only economic solution. It is the only guaranty to production and price reduction.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Has the gentleman any plan of complete eradication that he can suggest?

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Yes; I will come to that.

Mr. ALMON. In that connection, will the gentleman explain what they are doing with this appropriation except to furnish demonstration agents?

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Demonstration agents and investigations as to insects is all of which I know.

Mr. ALMON. They do not furnish any poison, do they?

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. No; none at all.

No appropriations have been made for weevil eradication. As proof of this assertion, I direct attention to language used by the Department of Agriculture in which it is said:

None of the cotton boll weevil appropriations made available to this department have been provided or used for eradication campaigns as such, but entirely for the investigation and demonstration of methods of combating the weevil.

We have never entered upon a weevil eradication program, but why should we not do so? Why should we not have done so ere this? Of course, weevil control is beneficial, but eradication is better if it can be obtained, and I believe it can. The brains and money of America can do anything humanly possible. Eradication is certainly necessary and I believe it can be accomplished. Do you ask whether I can do it? I may have an idea regarding the matter, but I would not foolishly attempt to impose it upon others. I believe I can suggest legislation that will enable others to do it. I have prepared a preliminary draft of a bill and shall submit it to those interested in the proposition and who should be in a position to determine not only as to the value of relief legislation, but also as to effective methods for weevil eradication. If it does not meet with approval, or afford constructive suggestions,

perhaps it may serve the purpose of interesting some one capable of intelligent action.

When we consider that the world's supply of cotton has for years steadily declined, that the surplus is less than half what it was three years ago; that America's surplus is less than one-third what it was even in 1921 and this, together with the fact that under the present system it has become necessary to double the cotton acreage in order to obtain previous production, even at four times the cost per pound, it appears to me that a continuance of the present system is inadvisable.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. May I have just one minute more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. If there are those who feel that weevil infestation is a local problem, that it concerns only the producer, and at most the spinners, their vision is indeed limited. Certainly the problem is no longer a local one. It is more than national. Involving both the physical and financial comforts of humanity, it has become world-wide in its effect and interests. Even those of most limited knowledge and foresight should readily understand that while the population of America and of the world continues to increase, that while the surplus of cotton in the United States and the world continues to disappear, and that while the weevil continues to spread and certain devastation follows in his wake, the problem can not become local, but must remain national, world-wide, and alarming.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not at this time move to increase the proposed appropriation. I believe we should first create a commission to study the weevil question and to recommend remedial legislation. As already indicated, I have made the first draft of a bill for this purpose. [Applause.]

Cotton acreage, production, and price, 1891 to 1923, inclusive

Year	Acreage harvested	Bales (500 pounds gross weight)	Average price per pound
1891	19,058,704	9,018,000	7.3
1892	15,911,361	6,664,000	8.4
1893	19,525,000	7,493,000	7.5
1894	23,687,950	9,476,435	5.9
1895	20,184,808	7,161,094	8.3
1896	23,273,209	8,532,705	7.3
1897	24,319,584	10,897,857	5.6
1898	24,967,285	11,189,205	4.9
1899	24,327,000	10,123,027	7.6
1900	24,933,000	10,123,027	9.3
1901	26,774,000	9,509,745	8.1
1902	27,175,000	10,630,945	8.2
1903	27,052,000	9,851,129	12.3
1904	31,215,000	13,438,012	8.7
1905	27,110,000	10,575,017	10.9
1906	31,374,000	13,273,809	10.0
1907	29,660,000	11,107,179	11.5
1908	32,444,000	13,241,799	9.2
1909	30,938,000	10,004,949	14.3
1910	32,403,000	11,608,616	14.0
1911	36,045,000	15,692,701	9.6
1912	34,283,000	13,703,421	11.5
1913	37,089,000	14,156,496	17.5
1914	36,832,000	16,134,930	7.3
1915	31,412,000	11,191,820	11.2
1916	34,985,000	11,449,930	17.3
1917	33,841,000	11,302,375	27.1
1918	36,008,000	12,040,532	28.8
1919	33,566,000	11,420,763	35.4
1920	35,878,000	13,439,603	18.8
1921	20,509,000	7,953,641	16.9
1922	33,036,000	9,761,817	22.8
1923	38,287,000	10,000,000	31.0

¹ Approximately.

Surplus cotton, 1921 to 1923, inclusive

1921 American surplus	9,172,000
1922 American surplus	5,123,000
1923 American surplus	3,065,000
1921 world surplus	14,540,000
1922 world surplus	9,536,000
1923 world surplus	6,341,000

APPROPRIATIONS FOR COTTON-BOLL WEEVIL WORK MADE SINCE MARCH 4, 1905

None of the cotton-boll weevil appropriations made available to this department has been provided or used for "eradication" campaigns as such, but entirely for the investigation and demonstration of methods of combating the weevil. The department's activities have been pursued along different lines—(1) the direct attack against the insect

itself under the Bureau of Entomology and (2) the work of the Bureau of Plant Industry in the development of types of cotton which might be successfully produced in the presence of, and in spite of, the weevil * * *. The amounts appropriated by Congress for these purposes since March 4, 1905, are as follows:

1. BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY

The following amounts were allotted for cotton-boll weevil investigations from appropriations made available to the Bureau of Entomology:

Total for Bureau of Entomology for boll weevil investigations, 1905 to 1923

Act	Date of approval	Amount
Agricultural appropriation act:		
1905	Apr. 23, 1904	\$16,955
1906	Mar. 3, 1905	53,105
1907	June 30, 1906	85,000
1908	Mar. 4, 1907	40,000
1909	May 23, 1908	10,145
1910	Mar. 4, 1909	11,065
1911	May 26, 1910	23,111
1912	Mar. 4, 1911	24,865
1913	Aug. 10, 1912	19,071
1914	Mar. 4, 1913	24,117
1915	June 30, 1914	28,637
1916	Mar. 4, 1915	28,787
1917	Aug. 11, 1916	30,688
1918	Mar. 4, 1917	49,524
1919	Oct. 1, 1918	48,211
1920	July 24, 1919	63,605
1921	May 31, 1920	89,661
1922	Mar. 3, 1921	84,282
1923	May 11, 1922	100,581
Third deficiency appropriation act, 1923	Mar. 3, 1923	40,000
Agricultural appropriation act, 1924	Feb. 26, 1923	102,750
Total for boll weevil investigations		954,100

2. BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY

The following allotments were made for the investigation of improved methods for cotton production under boll weevil conditions, from the appropriation "crop acclimatization and adaptation investigations, general expenses, Bureau of Plant Industry," carried in the agricultural appropriation act for the fiscal years indicated. No funds were used for this purpose prior to the fiscal year 1907.

Total for Bureau of Plant Industry, for investigation of cotton production under boll-weevil conditions

Act	Date of approval	Amount
Agricultural appropriation act:		
1907	June 30, 1906	\$6,000
1908	Mar. 4, 1907	7,000
1909	May 23, 1908	7,800
1910	Mar. 4, 1909	6,700
1911	May 26, 1910	15,500
1912	Mar. 4, 1911	16,000
1913	Aug. 10, 1912	14,250
1914	Mar. 4, 1913	14,300
1915	June 30, 1914	17,500
1916	Mar. 4, 1915	17,500
1917	Aug. 11, 1916	20,500
1918	Mar. 4, 1917	25,500
1919	Oct. 1, 1918	38,300
1920	July 24, 1919	37,520
1921	May 31, 1920	47,580
1922	Mar. 3, 1921	47,580
1923	May 11, 1922	47,580
1924	Feb. 26, 1923	71,710
Total for investigation of cotton production under boll weevil conditions		453,020

Bureau of Entomology, for cotton-boll weevil investigation \$954,100
Bureau of Plant Industry, for investigation of cotton production under boll weevil conditions 453,020

Total for boll weevil investigations 1,412,120

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to strike out the last word. My colleague from Georgia [Mr. LARSEN] presents the boll weevil situation in a very alarming way, but did not suggest, as I requested, a means by which we were to reach the eradication of the boll weevil.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. I would have done so, but I did not have the time.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Of course, I can not agree with my colleague that it would be a profitable or proper thing for

the South, if it could, to plant 38,000,000 acres in cotton and produce 18,000,000 bales per annum.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. But would not the gentleman say it was a good thing for the South and a good thing for the country if the South could plant one-half of that acreage and produce the same amount of cotton that it does produce?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. But it is not likely we would plant more than we would under weevil conditions.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. I do not believe it would be profitable for the South to carry on an annual production of cotton of 18,000,000 bales.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. But the gentleman must get away from the South and consider the country at large.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. I am speaking in the interest of the producer, because that would be a production which would run ahead of the world demand for cotton. We produce 60 per cent of the world's supply.

Now, as to the question of the eradication of the boll weevil. If the gentleman from Georgia has a bill which he proposes to introduce that would provide a means of doing that, of course that would be news which would be profoundly and gladly received by the country, and especially by the South. But the investigations that have been made by the Department of Agriculture, and the increase in this appropriation of some \$41,000 to continue those investigations, has convinced the South, the cotton producer, and the country that there is no method by which the boll weevil may be exterminated, abolished, or eradicated. That is the view of those who have studied it most closely.

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. KING. I have been sitting here listening to the discussion of the boll weevil, and is it a fact that the gentleman is contending that the boll weevil is a benefit to the cotton producers of the South in price?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. No; I do not take that position, but I do take the position that we have come to the point where we have reached the conclusion that the boll weevil can not be eradicated.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Who has reached that conclusion?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. And the production of cotton has become so expensive that the southern farmer has found it more profitable to carry on the best means of boll-weevil control—because without control he could not produce any cotton at all—and crop diversification; that is the system he has adopted. Under the investigations made by the Department of Agriculture it is practicable to control the boll weevil and produce cotton to meet average demands on a smaller acreage than 38,000,000 acres per year.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. There has been no appropriation for eradication; eradication has never been entered upon, and no one has ever attempted to eradicate the boll weevil; so how does the gentleman say we have reached the conclusion that it can not be eradicated when no effort has ever been made to do it?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Because the investigations show that wherever the boll weevil has appeared in cotton-growing districts complete eradication has been impossible, and the only method by which that might be accomplished would be to absolutely suspend all cotton production for a number of years, because cotton is the only plant upon which the boll weevil lives.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Would not the gentleman say one year instead of a number of years?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Well, I do not know whether one year would be sufficient. But the methods adopted for boll-weevil control, as worked out through the assistance of the Department of Agriculture, have shown that it is practicable to produce cotton under boll-weevil conditions. It is an uphill fight, and it is very expensive. At the Tallulah station, in my district, the method of control by the use of powdered calcium arsenate has been worked out, and that is approved by the Department of Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. It has been shown that the production of cotton may be increased from 25 to 30 per cent where this method of control by the use of powdered calcium arsenate, is properly carried out under the department's instructions.

The appropriation recommended by the committee is an increase over what the department asked, but if all the activities in contemplation were carried out probably this appropriation should be increased.

The main thing concerning the cotton farmer is the proper control of the boll weevil in cotton production. In experiments which have been made it is shown that by the expenditure of from \$5 to \$6 per acre the production may be increased from 25 to 35 per cent, and that would be in value from \$25 to \$30 per acre.

I have made a personal inspection of places where this system of poisoning was carried on, and the results have been, in the poisoned cotton, from a half bale to three-quarters of a bale per acre, where probably the production would not be over a quarter of a bale when there was no control of boll weevil at all.

We might as well accept it as a practical proposition that the boll weevil is here and that we must adopt some practical method of boll-weevil control, and that to completely eradicate is not possible.

The production in cotton of 10,000,000 bales, of course, does not meet the world's demand upon the South, but I believe the situation would be better if we could keep the production somewhere below 15,000,000 bales and diversify our crops. That is the slogan all over the country. The safest figure for the producer would be 12,000,000 bales.

The additional studies requested for the poisoning of the boll weevil are, first, for new types of calcium arsenate. The next is some manner by which the production of calcium arsenate may be increased and then sold to the farmer at a lower cost. It is selling now from 20 to 22 cents a pound. That is about the price paid last year.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. In that connection, will the gentleman state what it was worth when it was first discovered to be effective in the control of the boll weevil, some four years ago?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. I do not recall the exact figures.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. About 3 cents a pound, was it not?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. I say I do not recall; but now it ranges around 20 cents a pound. It is estimated that if the production of calcium arsenate could be increased so that it could reach the farmer at 10 cents a pound the owner of the plantation and the owner of the small farm by the use of dusting machines—the high-powered dusting machines for the large plantation and a hand duster for the small farm—the entire Cotton Belt could adopt the method recommended by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. The gentleman comes from one of the Southern States where they raise a great deal of cotton, and I wonder if they have ever experimented to ascertain if the boll weevil will disappear if they cease raising cotton for a number of seasons.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. No; I do not know any place where that has been tried. When the boll weevil first crossed the Texas border there was a zone laid off for a short while, but I do not think any satisfactory experiment has been made. However, it has been found that the cotton-boll weevil feeds only upon the cotton plant, and investigations are now going on to find out just what quality there is in the cotton plant that attracts the boll weevil, hoping through that investigation to reach some way of ascertaining exactly the information that would answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. DENISON. I do not know whether the gentleman knows it or not, but in southern Illinois, which has always been considered, of course, a northern State, we are turning our fields into cotton, and they are raising as fine cotton as I have ever seen. The same thing is true in Missouri. We are there entirely free from the boll weevil, because the temperature is such, they say, that the boll weevil can not live. I was wondering if it might not be found that a solution of the boll-weevil problem would be to cease raising cotton for a certain number of years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two minutes more.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in two minutes.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman make it four minutes? I would like to have two minutes.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I will amend the request and make it four minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. I am acquainted with the situation in Illinois and Missouri where cotton is being raised and where the boll weevil has not infested that territory. I am not sure the gentleman can feel safe against the appearance of the boll weevil. However, long winters and differences in climatic conditions will relieve them somewhat from the disaster which will follow if it does appear. The entire belt, outside of that particular section, is now affected. The only argument I know of, that you might exterminate the boll weevil by ceasing cotton production, is based upon the fact that that is the only plant upon which it feeds; but I want to state that the use of powdered calcium arsenate, as outlined by the Department of Agriculture, to my mind, is the only satisfactory method of boll-weevil control. I think we should feel indebted to the Committee on Appropriations for increasing the amount for this investigation.

Another thing that is now under consideration is the matter of cooperation between the State agricultural colleges or other activities of the States and the Department of Agriculture. For instance, in South Carolina the legislature appropriated \$25,000 to be used in connection with \$25,000 from the Government to carry on a station suitable to the particular location. If this is carried out in every State with every agricultural college, where young men would be trained, it will be a great advantage because you will find, if you ever investigate the matter personally, that very few farmers know what the degree of infestation of the boll weevil is at any period. You need an agent to go and gauge the infestation, to give instructions in the use of calcium arsenate, and an inspector always to see that you get the pure article.

Therefore I simply hold out the hope to my fellow Congressmen and citizens from the Cotton Belt that it is strictly a question of boll-weevil control. Extermination of the boll weevil without the abolishment of cotton growing is simply an impossibility.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to repeat that the prosperity of the South depends upon the successful and profitable production of cotton. Boll-weevil infestation makes it more difficult to produce this staple, hence it becomes necessary to so diversify our crops as to adjust matters to a smaller production. It also becomes necessary to adopt methods of boll-weevil control so as to reach a reasonable production per acre. Therefore, whether the South chooses to do so or not, conditions necessitate reduction of acreage planted to cotton.

It is my opinion, after very careful investigation, that the South will be more prosperous if it can limit cotton production to not more than 12,000,000 bales per year on about 75 per cent of the acreage now planted to cotton, using the excess acreage for other crops.

The carry-over of cotton is smaller than usual and has been diminishing for the past three years, but it would be a mistake to use this as an incentive for an increase in cotton acreage. The world is not in financial condition to consume cotton at the normal rate and this disordered state of affairs has no prospect of being adjusted for several years to come.

We are facing a situation in agriculture as well as in industry that can be solved only by patience, good judgment, common sense, and proper management. Even with a 12,000,000-bale cotton crop the producer must have some kind of cooperative and coordinated marketing facilities, and this, in my judgment, should be financed in the South, in the cotton-producing States, controlled and directed by the producers, the banks and business organizations financing the same. Whenever this marketing control is centralized and removed to Washington, placed under the direction of some Government bureau, the spinners and speculators will gain control and the producer, I fear, will be forgotten. For the first time in our history since the Civil War the South has sufficient banking interests and capital to control the marketing of its crops, and it is simply a

question of whether we may so cooperate as to take advantage of that opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. I make the same request, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana and the gentleman from Georgia ask unanimous consent to extend their remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD as indicated a while ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thought the gentleman had that privilege.

Mr. RAKER. No; somebody objected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks as indicated a moment ago. Is there objection?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I did not understand, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RAKER. It is just to print a short amendment on another bill, which will only take about 4 or 5 inches of printed space.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, under the permission given, I am herewith submitting a proposed amendment, which I will offer as a new section to H. R. 4830 at the proper place in said bill, which proposed amendment reads as follows:

SEC. —. (1) That when used in this section, unless the context indicates otherwise, the term "lands of the United States" means lands set apart, reserved, or withdrawn under the provisions of section 24 of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1891, entitled "An act to repeal timber culture laws, and for other purposes," and acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto, or obtained or acquired under the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stats. L., p. 961), and acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto.

(The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.)

(2) That the United States Government hereby assumes, subject to the conditions of the section, or any subsequent act of Congress, the payment to the several States of sums of money equivalent to the amounts which such States would receive from the taxation of said lands of the United States within their respective borders if such lands were owned by individuals.

(3) That the Secretary shall, as soon as practicable after the passage of this act and annually thereafter, at such time of the year as the legislature of the State may designate, send a statement to the governor, or such other officer as the legislature may designate, of every State in which such lands are located, describing the location, size, and character of all lands of the United States within the border of such State, together with such information respecting such lands as he may possess which may be useful in properly determining their value.

(4) That no payments shall be made to any State under the provisions of this section until such State has, with respect to the lands of the United States in question, acting through its officers and agents duly authorized therefor—

(a) Properly assessed such lands of the United States at a rate no higher than that at which other similar lands within such State are assessed.

(b) Applied to such assessed valuation a factor no higher than the tax rate applied to the assessed value of other similar lands within such State.

(c) Secured in this manner a figure from which shall be deducted any allowances made by such State to its taxpayers in similar cases for prompt payment of taxes or for any other reason.

(d) Certified the figures so reached with respect to each piece of such lands of the United States, accompanied by statements as to the methods employed in arriving at such figures, to the secretary.

(e) Furnished the secretary with such further information as he may request respecting the methods employed in valuing and assessing such lands of the United States and in assessing and taxing other similar lands within the State.

(f) Complied with such rules and regulations as the secretary may prescribe for carrying out the provisions of this section.

(5) That the Secretary shall receive and examine the figures submitted by the States under the provisions of subdivision 4 of this section. In the event that any State shall submit figures with respect to any lands of the United States based (1) on a higher valuation than the Secretary believes to be the actual value of such lands, or (2) on a higher rate of assessment or of taxation than he believes is

employed in the case of other similar lands within such State, or (3) in whole or in part on any other improper consideration he shall so revise and reduce such figures as to allow and compensate for such error or miscalculation. Such revised and reduced figures shall be final and conclusive when so determined by the Secretary, except that he may, in his discretion, permit any State affected by such revision or reduction to offer such evidence and argument respecting the matters in question as he may deem advisable, after which the Secretary may change his determination in such manner as he shall deem proper.

(6) That the Secretary shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury annually and as promptly as practicable with respect to every State receiving benefits hereunder the amounts to which such State is entitled under the provisions of this section. The Secretary of the Treasury shall thereupon cause such amounts to be paid to the designated officers of the States indicated. Whenever the Secretary shall determine that any State has, for any reason, been paid more than the amounts to which it is entitled under the provisions of this section, he shall deduct such overpayments from the next amounts certified to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to such State.

(7) That no payments shall be made to any State, under the provisions of this section, with respect to any such lands of the United States which do not remain such for the entire tax year of the State in which they are located, nor with respect to any such lands of the United States which the State might lawfully tax by reason of the fact that the beneficial interest in such lands is not vested in the United States.

(8) That the Secretary shall have power to prescribe rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of this section.

(9) That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to enable the Secretary of the Treasury from time to time to make the payments required by this section.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this appropriation, but I am wondering what the Secretary of Agriculture or the Department of Agriculture is going to do for the farmer in the way of the control or eradication of the boll weevil in the cotton-growing States, more than has already been done, through this increased appropriation of more than \$40,000. I am wondering if some member of the subcommittee, probably Mr. BUCHANAN, of Texas, can give us some information on that subject.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The increase of \$44,920 is intended to be used, first, in experimentation. The department claims they have reason to believe that they have evolved manufacturing machinery for calcium arsenate which can be put up for \$8,000, thereby reducing the cost of calcium arsenate two-thirds of what it now costs. That is one of the purposes for the increased appropriation. The second purpose is in connection with the use of the calcium arsenate. By experiments with the airplane in poisoning cotton with calcium arsenate they discovered that the poison left the airplane charged with positive electricity. It is all charged with the same character of electricity; and as like repels like, therefore the particles of poison were separated, and each particle would stand off to itself and settle on the cotton to itself. They also discovered that the cotton plant was charged by nature with negative electricity, so that the negative electrically charged cotton plant attracted to it the positive electrically charged poison and caused it to adhere to the plant.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, we ought to get the balance of this statement, and I ask unanimous consent that my colleague may finish the enlightening remarks he is making.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask that it be limited to five minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, he only wants two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Of course, it has been known for a long time that plant life was charged with negative electricity, and through the operation of the airplane they learned that the poison left the airplane charged with positive electricity. The department came in and requested an appropriation of \$235,000 for the development of a special type of airplane with which to poison cotton. At this time this process is impracticable. The sentiment of the farmer has not reached the stage where universal poisoning would be approved. Neither would an airplane be within the financial reach of the farmer. Therefore the committee saw proper to vote down this request, but made an additional appropriation so that they might experiment with ground machinery in order to charge this poison with positive electricity, so that it would be attracted to the plant when it was sought to be applied.

Gentlemen who do not live in cotton communities do not understand that the ordinary method of poisoning cotton with calcium arsenate can not be done unless the cotton leaf is damp with dew or rain. Therefore the farmers of the South when they are applying calcium arsenate have to poison at night while the plant is damp so that the poison will stick.

Now, if this new development in the scientific world is true and they find they can charge this poison with positive electricity, the plant being charged with negative electricity, the plants will attract the poison and then they can poison at any time of day and in any climate, whether dry or damp.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield? That assumes you will use the airplane for the distribution.

Mr. BUCHANAN. No; it does not.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. It means the use of some other—

Mr. BUCHANAN. No; it does not.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. The gentleman did not let me finish—the use of some other high-powered machine.

Mr. BUCHANAN. No; it does not.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. It is a fact, I believe, that the airplane would cause it to adhere.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes; they have established that as a fact. Here is what it means: It means that if you manufacture the poison so that when it leaves the manufacturer it will be charged with the positive electricity, it can be applied with any ordinary machine.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Does the gentleman think that would be an absolute cure for the boll weevil?

Mr. BUCHANAN. No; we have no absolute cure. We will never have an absolute cure. We have the boll weevil with us for all time.

Mr. ABERNETHY. But this will be very helpful the gentleman thinks?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to say that in a former deficiency bill we appropriated \$40,000 for experimental work in the operation of airplane work for the eradication of the boll weevil. I was wondering what success came of it.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is what I have been speaking of. They borrowed five Army airplanes for experiments, and they succeeded in spreading the poison splendidly; as far as it went from the machine to the cotton it was a success. By reason of these experiments they ascertained that the poison would stick to the plant because it was charged with electricity opposite to that of the plant.

Mr. MADDEN. Does it injure the plant?

Mr. BUCHANAN. No; if it is properly mixed no amount will injure the plant.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. If the gentleman will yield, I want to say to my friend from Illinois, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who recommended that \$40,000, that it was spent in my district, and they found that the great force with which the calcium was driven through the airplane made it mingle better and it stayed much better on the cotton plant.

The water supply for the boll weevil is the dew that is on the cotton. That is when he comes out to drink. We have got that much from the airplane experiments and found that we could run as high as 400 or 500 acres an hour, while 70 or 80 acres a day is all that you could cover with the big power dusting machine.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Another purpose of this increased appropriation is to evolve a cheaper ground machine to apply the poison. To-day it costs \$350, and they believe they can manufacture a ground machine to poison the cotton for a great deal less. If they do, it will put the poison machines within the reach of the ordinary farmer, the farmer who cultivates from 25 to 100 acres. If they do that, it will be a commendable work. That is the purpose of this increase in the appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, may I have leave to insert in the RECORD a table of 102 experiments conducted by the Bureau of Entomology showing the field tests, cost per acre, number of applications, and increased production of the six leading remedies for the boll weevil?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to insert a table. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The table is as follows:

Summary of United States Bureau of Entomology 1933 field tests comparing certain suggestions for weevil control
TALLULAH, LA.

Method	Average number applications	Season's total cost per acre			Seed cotton production per acre				Method over checks per acre	
		Material	Applying	Total	Un-treated checks	Treated plats	Increase over check		Profit	Loss
							Gain	Loss		
Home-made molasses mixture.....	7.9	\$1.98	\$1.32	\$3.30	940	1,035	86		\$5.47	
Florida method.....	1.4	.70	2.25	2.95	748	784	36		.78	
Hill's mixture.....	7.7	7.51	1.57	9.08	1,086	1,067		19		\$10.98
Weevilnip.....	6.5	4.57	1.57	6.14	1,034	1,045	11			5.00
Roll-we-go.....	6.0	8.07	.48	8.55	1,124	1,383	59			2.55
Dusted calcium arsenate.....	5.4	4.32	.63	4.95	1,067	1,293	226		18.05	

Total number of plats in this series of experiments, 102.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations of insects affecting truck crops, including insects affecting the potato, sugar beet, cabbage, onion, tomato, beans, peas, etc., and insects affecting stored products, \$145,000.

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the wisdom of our fathers in launching this Republic is still a marvel and an inspiration. But they were pathfinders. They sailed an uncharted sea in nation building. They could not foresee everything. They could not compass all eventualities. Their national perspective was inevitably restricted by the limitations of their colonial experience, out of which they constructed the framework of an infant nation. This fact was recognized by Washington in his Farewell Address.

The burdens upon the President of the United States are increasingly intolerable. He ought to be relieved, as far as possible, from the stupendous personal and official responsibility of Cabinet selection and Cabinet action. I have introduced a bill providing that all Cabinet officers shall be elected by the people on the same ticket with the President under the same laws and regulations governing the election of President and Vice President of the United States, with the proviso that in case of death, resignation, or vacancy from any other cause the President shall fill such vacancy for the unexpired term by appointment, with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Why should this not be done? It is a proposal of governmental sanity and safety. It is broadly, fundamentally, and inspiringly American. Have not the people a right to know who will compose the President's official family before they vote for him? If not, why not? Cabinet officers are certainly as vitally connected with the interests of the people as Congressmen and Senators and other elective officials.

It is an age-long custom—a custom almost mandatory—for sheriffs and other county and State officials to name their deputies, and the strength or weakness of a candidate's cabinet makes largely for his victory or defeat. In most States the heads of all State departments are independently elected.

To have a presidential candidate name the proposed members of his Cabinet for ratification at the polls would be taking the American people into a very wholesome confidence. Certain it is that the preselection selection of Cabinet officers by the President and the people would guarantee deliberation and locate responsibility in a way thoroughly satisfactory to a discriminating public; and certainly, too, this change, which might seem at first revolutionary, would relieve the incoming President of any preselection obligation. And certainly, again, the geographical distribution of Cabinet candidates over the Nation would largely remove the temptation and the supposed necessity for such stupendous campaign contributions.

The Napoleon of some great scheming campaign or convention scramble would be forever unknown as a White House liability in our future political life. Can we bring ourselves to visualize this essential and refreshing national relief? The people! The people! They would be in the saddle as never before, first-hand and forever. This vital change would help to strike the fetters from our present executive system and prove a practical safeguard in the march of real democracy. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UPSHAW. I will yield.

Mr. MADDEN. How does this subject which the gentleman has been discussing relate to the item under consideration?

Mr. UPSHAW. Because I moved to "strike out the last word," as countless other Members have done "out of order,"

and I had the consent of the chairmen of both sides that I might proceed with this tremendously vital matter, worth perhaps more to our reputation and national safety than this agricultural discussion right now. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UPSHAW. All right.

Mr. BLANTON. The newspapers report that the distinguished gentleman from Georgia is going to be one end of one of the national tickets. I was wondering if he would not prefer to choose his own running mate with respect to the Cabinet. [Laughter.]

Mr. UPSHAW. I would suggest to the genial gentleman from Texas in reply to his generous interruption that I am not responsible for what some newspapers say. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. UPSHAW. I ask for one minute more to reply to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Make it two minutes; I want to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks for one minute more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. UPSHAW. The people of America would be tremendously relieved, I think, if they knew the Cabinet members beforehand, and the President would often be saved from great embarrassment. Better the searchlight of campaign scrutiny before holding the office than the spotlight of shocking revelations afterwards. Certainly no man ought to be considered or voted for on a national ticket who is not willing to show his hand and name his Cabinet advisers and executives in a great democracy like ours. As I said in the beginning, it would relieve the President of a tremendous responsibility and give great satisfaction to a discriminating American public. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

To investigate and encourage the adoption of improved methods of farm management and farm practice, \$275,000: *Provided*, That of this amount \$150,000 may be used in ascertaining the cost of production of the principal staple agricultural products.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee what progress the department is making in determining the cost of the production of the principal staple agricultural products. That is a matter which has been discussed for a long time. The wisdom of the appropriation has been questioned largely on account of the difficulty of reaching anything like satisfactory results. I should be pleased to learn from the chairman of the committee that real progress is being made in this most difficult matter.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am unable to state just how much progress has been made, but the department I should say is making progress. There probably will always be room for more progress.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. It is true as a general proposition that we naturally hope for progress; but I am one of those who have doubted whether much progress could be made—real progress—in ascertaining the cost of the production of the staple agricultural products. So much depends upon climate, the nature of the soil, the manner in which the soil is treated, the kind of seed used, when and how it is put into the ground, the practice and habit, the skill and industry or otherwise of those who cultivate the soil; so many different

matters enter into this proposition that while conditions may seem to be the same, yet they are entirely different, even on neighboring farms. I have doubted whether real progress is being made or could be made in this matter about which we hear so much talk and on which we spend so much money. If even reasonably accurate results can be reached, or results that are reasonably satisfactory, the expenditure of a large sum of money is justified. I am not opposing this appropriation, in the first place, because I do not know what the department is doing and because we often find that in the most unpromising fields good results are reached. I wanted to know what is being done with this money.

We continue to appropriate the same amount in each appropriation bill for this department. It may be my fault altogether, but the data prepared by the Department of Agriculture did not come to my attention.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. We had very extensive hearings on the subject, and the gentleman may get some of the information he desires if he would read the statement made on this particular matter.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. As I said and as I believe, it is largely my fault. I should have gathered the information from the hearings.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. I regard this feature of the work in the department as one that is most important. It seems to me that looking toward improving the conditions of agriculture, when you get down into determining the cost of the production, you are doing work that is of very vital importance.

I have had the privilege of looking over several bulletins that have been prepared, not only by our own Department of Agriculture but by various departments of agriculture in the various States, and they give valuable and helpful information along this line. They indicate that very substantial progress is being made. As far as I am personally concerned, I am not only heartily in favor of this amendment but wish that the appropriation might be increased.

Consideration of this appropriation bill forces us to face a problem which has many difficult phases. To deal justly with any one of them all of them must be studied together. This I have been endeavoring to do and should like to submit a few observations concerning the general agricultural situation, and for this purpose I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, it is probably true that there is no theme more widely discussed in the United States to-day than that of agriculture. Our papers, both farm journals, weekly newspapers, and even the great metropolitan dailies, have carried in their editorials, as well as in their news columns, splendid discussions—constructive discussion for the most part—of the many problems that surround this great fundamental business, there is scarcely a platform to-day from which men speak where they do not include, in the subjects they present to the public, discussions of this great business. The very fact that our great Chautauquas and our great lecture courses find places on their programs for constructive discussions on this great business indicates very clearly the unusual interest that is taken in this great subject, not only by the people who live in the country but also those who live in the cities.

When anyone rises to-day to discuss the subject of agriculture there are two viewpoints that may be presented. One is negative and destructive in its character, finding no sort of comfort or consolation and but little hope in the present situation, and finding fault with everything that has been done to advance agriculture. The other viewpoint is a positive and constructive one; one that does find in the situation something of hope, something of promise, and then endeavors, as best it can, to present some means by which the condition may be improved, although not as good as it should be.

Now, if I were minded to do so this afternoon, I think that without any great amount of trouble I might make something of a speech of the first character, a negative one, a destructive one; in fact, I think possibly I might express the voice of a great many farmers to-day if I should indulge myself in that sort of an argument and in that kind of a discussion. But whenever I am inclined to find fault, whenever I am inclined to be negative or destructive in discussing the problems of agriculture I am reminded of an experience of years ago in listening to one of the great lecturers of the country, whose subject I have forgotten, whose outline has completely left my mind, but who left with me one illustration, which I always recall in this connection. Said he, "Any mule can kick over a structure but it takes an architect to build it up." "Mule" was not exactly the term he used but it is the society name for the animal. Whenever I am inclined to be destruc-

tive, I am reminded of that illustration. Therefore, for the few moments that I shall occupy, I want to attempt something in the way of constructive discussion.

In the first place, may I attempt a definition of what the agriculture of the United States really is? Measured in terms of arithmetic as applied to the number of farms, we find that they number 6,500,000. Living upon these farms are approximately 29,000,000 people, constituting almost exactly 27 per cent of our population and representing, according to the census of 1920, a wealth of \$77,000,000,000.

From the standpoint of the nationality of the men and women who live upon the land, I am very glad to say that the discussions of the last week or 10 days upon the immigration bill have developed the fact that nearly 90 per cent of those living upon the farms of the United States are native-born American citizens. In the light of the stress that is being put upon our institutions in these days and in the light of the rapidly increasing proportion of foreign-born citizens in the great centers of population I want to say to the members of this committee that the statement that 90 per cent of the people who live upon the farms of the United States are native born is a consideration that ought not to be passed lightly by. Remember that out there in the open country is a force, a strong force, of native-born citizenship, steeped in the traditions of this beloved land of ours, that will "stand to and abide by" in the days of storm and stress.

In the matter of home ownership a statement can be made with reference to the farmers of the United States that is also of unusual significance. Sixty per cent of the men and women who live in the open country own their own homes. The average for the whole United States is but 40 per cent.

If the average for the whole United States is 40 per cent and that out in the open country is 60 per cent, what must be the condition in the great centers of population? I do not want to be an alarmist, but I do think it is worthy of a moment's emphasis to point to the greatest of our cities, the great city of New York, and to make the statement that not quite 10 per cent of the people who live within the borders of that great city own their own homes. Among the larger cities of the country that have the highest percentage of home ownership is the home city of the distinguished chairman of the committee at this time the city of Des Moines, Iowa, but the percentage of home ownership in that fine city is but slightly above 50 per cent. The city of Grand Rapids, Mich., enjoys the distinction of being the second in the United States of the larger cities in its proportion of home ownership, but its percentage is slightly under 50 per cent. With these facts in mind, I am sure you will agree that the 60 per cent of home ownership out in the open country is a tremendously important factor in these days, when the currents of life are moving so rapidly that we scarcely know from one day to another what will be the shift in public sentiment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KETCHAM. May I have five minutes more?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. KETCHAM. If the nationality of the men and women who live in the open country is important, if the percentage of home ownership is a vital consideration, and if their wealth and the proportion of population that they bear to the rest of the country are important factors, then one or two other things ought to be brought to your attention.

They do things in the open country. It is not my purpose this afternoon to rehearse the war record of the men and women who live on the farms, but it will always be a very great matter of pride to recall that 35 per cent of the fine young men who answered the call to the colors in the days of the World War came from the farms; it will always be a matter of the extreme pride to me to note that the fathers, mothers, sisters, and younger sons of the family produced crops 130 per cent above normal, in spite of the fact that nearly 2,000,000 of their finest and best manpower had been taken away. Such is the patriotism of the men and women who live upon the farms of the United States. [Applause.] Not only in times of war do they respond, but in times of peace. I would like the members of this committee to stop and think for a moment when men sometimes standing upon this floor speak in rather light terms, sometimes even approaching a sneer, of the farmers who call upon Congress for legislation. I would like to have them note that the farmers of the United States represent but 2 per cent of the population of the whole round world, and yet in the last year for which we have the record this 2 per cent produced 24 per cent of the agricultural wealth of the whole world. So that in times of

peace, as well as in times of war, these men and women are not wanting when it comes to doing things that are significant.

But from another viewpoint, particularly related to the business interests of our country, agriculture should be defined. Farmers not only produce the necessities of life in the way of food and the raw materials that go into manufacture but they offer a market of no inconsiderable proportion for the manufactured goods of the country. I wish that more of our friends from New England were upon the floor this afternoon. I am glad that a number of them are present, and especially pleased to hear the distinguished Member from Connecticut [Mr. Trison] indicate his interest in this problem and offer his support to any constructive legislation which will correct the situation. The men from New England ought to bear in mind this fact, which is very intimately and closely related to the welfare of that great manufacturing center, namely, that the farmers of the country constitute 35 per cent of the buying power, and when they are out of the market there is a very material dent made in the prosperity of that great section of the country.

Mr. Chairman, this little survey, this little attempt at a definition of what agriculture means, would certainly indicate that agriculture is entitled to an important place in our legislative program and is a vital factor in the scheme of things as we have worked it out here in the United States.

In my opinion just this hurried and incomplete sketch should be sufficient to silence the criticisms that are sometimes directed at farm legislation under the general charge of "class" legislation. It is hard to conceive anything more intimately related to our national welfare than the progress and prosperity of the farmers, and I am confident that this Congress in both its branches will give strong indorsement to such a program of legislation as will contribute to this end.

If this be granted, it is certainly in order to determine specifically what needs to be done to locate the trouble so that a proper remedy may be applied.

What is the difficulty with agriculture? Hours could be consumed in answering this question and bitter controversy possibly aroused as to the whys and wherefores of it. I shall not weary the committee with a long-drawn-out discussion but come straight to the point. The farmer's trouble centers around the lack of an adequate price for his products. Measured by its comparative commodity value his dollar is a 72-cent dollar. In other words, the exchange value of his commodities is upon that basis. He can not survive under such conditions, and the best thought of the country should concentrate on this problem and devise ways and means by which this great disparity may be removed.

The pre-war ratio of corn and pig iron was 18 to 1 (18 bushels of corn to a ton of pig iron in market value). In 1917 this ratio was 28 to 1. In February of 1921 when deflation had done its worst for the farmers it was 47 to 1 and in December of 1923 it had reached 29 to 1. Corn and pig iron are standard examples of price levels in agriculture and in industry and show graphically the present price disadvantage at which the farmer is placed.

What shall be done? How shall the price of farm products be put on a parity with general commodity prices? What sound program can be devised to accomplish this result? Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the answer will not be found in wild charges and threats, in demagogic appeals, or in partisan flub-dub. It will be found in a clear apprehension and a frank acknowledgment of the situation on the part of all our people, both city and country, and an equally sincere and earnest effort to meet it fairly and justly. It will be found in a careful study of the experience of others who have met and mastered like difficulties as they have developed in recurring cycles through the years. Such experience seems to point out clearly a few steps that can and should be taken.

First, continued emphasis must be placed on reducing farm production cost by improved methods and management. Wonderful progress has been registered by the American farmer in this regard in recent years. He is the best farmer the world knows, whether judged by his individual production or by production per unit of land. Every help and encouragement should be given him to continue this progress. Not only must his best thought be given to economical production but a method must be found to regulate or handle the surplus of agricultural products. It is surely an unsound national policy to force farmers to restrict production of foodstuffs in order to secure an adequate price, but if another way can not be found to meet the situation that course will be the only one open to them.

Economical production and the avoidance of surpluses is but one phase of the farm rehabilitation program. Orderly and

economical marketing of farm products must go along with it. The "spread" between producer and consumer is the vital consideration here. How can this be lessened? One thing must be done and that is to remove speculation, price control or manipulation from our processes of food distribution. Service in food distribution, whether performed by individuals, corporations, or cooperative associations, is deserving of adequate pay. The rapid development of the cooperative movement among farmers is an effort to lessen distribution costs at one end of the line and bring a larger net return for farm products back to the producer. This constructive step on the part of farmers should likewise receive every encouragement at the hands of Congress. The very comprehensive measure introduced recently by my colleague, Mr. WILLIAMS of Michigan, goes right to the point of this great question and undoubtedly points the way to Federal legislation that will stimulate cooperative marketing.

When it can be said that \$2 is required to get \$1 worth of farm products from producer to consumer, the necessity for action becomes overwhelming. This necessity has caused the widespread growth of the cooperative plan of marketing farm crops. So universally has it been adopted that Federal legislation is demanded and will undoubtedly be enacted.

The third step in a rehabilitation program for agriculture is a general Federal legislative one. Here two extremes must be avoided. One, the cry for Congress or State legislatures to "do something about it" in the way of legislation whenever a disagreeable situation arises; the other that classic of the conservative, "economic ills can not be cured by legislation." What is the plain truth? Many unhappy conditions can not be improved by legislation. Climate, seasons, soils, location, and management are outside the law. On the other hand, it is foolish to assert that legislation has not effected our economic situation. The echoes have scarcely ceased in this Chamber from the discussion of one such piece of legislation. No laboring man needs anyone to tell him the effects of millions of immigrants on his wage scale and his standard of living. No railroad man needs to be told of the economic effect of the Adamson or the Esch-Cummins laws. The tariff is possibly our oldest illustration. In short, these laws have effected our economic life. World conditions have made them necessary. We have built up a standard of living that leads the world. We are all for it and propose to maintain it. It costs more, but it is worth it. Because the farmer is not able to pass on the added costs which increased transportation rates impose on him and that higher wage scales demand of him, much of the new legislation has affected him unfavorably, however. The tariff is not fully effective in raising price levels on his export surplus. He produces a surplus of a number of the basic commodities which must find a market under world conditions from which much of our legislation has been designed to protect us. He buys by the American market and sells by the world market. If he is to survive he must be put on an American basis in his selling as well as his buying. To put him on such a basis is not doing him a favor. It is simply putting him on a par with the rest. It is plain justice. To acclaim the virtues of these higher standards of American life in one breath and in another to deny their practical application to all our people alike is a strange performance. It recalls some stirring references to "intellectual integrity" in other debates. The McNary-Haugen bill, now so widely discussed, is directed straight at this price inequality which the farmer suffers under because of his production of a surplus which must be exported. The widespread demand for this legislation is based on our American gospel of the "square deal."

The farmer in supporting it is simply asking that he be put on equal terms with the rest of the country who have been made the beneficiaries of Federal legislation. His attitude is well summed up in the words of Henry Van Dyke:

In the game of life, as we play it here in America, the rules must be the same for all; the penalties must be the same for all; the prizes of life, so far as we can make them so, must be the same for all—and may the best man win.

In the historic language of this Chamber, the farmer wants to "go along" on equal terms with the rest and not trailing along in the rear.

This is what the American farmer wants. [Applause.]

But, Mr. Chairman, this does not complete the program for agricultural rehabilitation. Organization must be added to the other suggestions that have been offered for the improvement of farm conditions. Living in the midst of organized effort on every hand, the farmer has learned its value, and the last few years have seen the greatest development in our history along this particular line. In this revival of farm or-

ganizations a new purpose and motive have developed that give promise of making both the new forms of organization as well as the old ones which have caught the idea more lasting and more effective. The old idea in many farm organizations was to fight something that some one else had started. The new idea is to lay out a program of your own and put it through. True it is that things still have to be opposed, but if an organization is to do its best, it must have a constructive program of its own to forward, and this makes its power to oppose hostile efforts all the more effective. Organization in agriculture is absolutely essential in these days of concerted effort in all other lines of endeavor. It is vital to the individual farmer whose whole training and daily experience put the emphasis on the individual side. It is an essential factor in the building of the best community life and the most effective means by which he can give expression to his views upon public questions. There was never a time when farm organizations could serve so useful a purpose as now, and every farmer ought to be actively interested in supporting them.

In the last analysis, Mr. Chairman, the problem of rehabilitated agriculture must get back to the individual farmer himself. All the best farm practice in production, all the newest plans for improved marketing of farm crops, all the laws, both State and Federal, that can be enacted, and all the farm organizations that can be developed can not bring success to the farmer unless he has within himself the necessary elements to achieve it. Public interest can not be charged with the guardianship of those who are wasteful and inefficient and who are doomed to failure under any circumstances and in any occupation, but it must take a very real interest in providing conditions so that the farmer's returns from the capital, time, brains, and effort he puts into this great fundamental business will match those of other callings and professions. This viewpoint, Mr. Chairman, justifies the active support we should give this appropriation bill and other measures that will upbuild and advance agriculture.

The Clerk read as follows:

For acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with the marketing, handling, utilization, grading, transportation, and distributing of farm and non-manufactured food products and the purchasing of farm supplies, including the demonstration and promotion of the use of uniform standards of classification of American farm products throughout the world, independently and in cooperation with other branches of the department, State agencies, purchasing and consuming organizations, and persons engaged in the marketing, handling, utilization, grading, transportation, and distributing of farm and food products, \$524,628.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. ASWELL: Page 54, line 3, at the end of the paragraph insert: "Purchase and distribution of vegetable, field, and flower seeds, plants, shrubs and vines, bulbs and cuttings of the freshest and best obtainable varieties, adapted to general cultivation, \$360,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary. The Secretary of Agriculture, after due advertisement and on competitive bids, is authorized to award the contract for the supply of printed packets and envelopes and the packeting, assembling, and mailing of the seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, or any part thereof, for a period of not more than five years nor less than one year, if by such action he can best protect the interests of the United States."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no law authorizing this activity and the amendment is not germane to this part of the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the further point of order that the amendment seeks through an order from this Congress, which expires on March 4, 1925, to give authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase seeds for the next five years, which extends his authority nearly four years beyond the life of this Congress, which is unauthorized by law. I make the further point of order that not only is the amendment not germane to this paragraph, but it is not germane to any paragraph in the bill.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill is to make appropriations for the Department of Agriculture. This language follows the language of the organic act. A bill similar to this amendment has been reported by the Committee on Agriculture. This is an appropriation for the coming year. It seems entirely just that the House should be permitted to discuss this point of order and to vote upon the proposal at this time. I insist that this is in line with the language of the organic act and is entirely in order at this point.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to discuss the point of order. I quote from Barnes Federal Statutes,

not appropriation acts but permanent law. Article 618 provides for the establishment of the Department of Agriculture; and in defining the duties of the Department of Agriculture it uses this language:

The general design and duties of which shall be to acquire and diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on the subject connected with agriculture in the most general comprehensive sense of that word, and to procure, propagate, and distribute among the people new and valuable seeds and plants.

That is section 618 of the permanent statutes. Now, section 639 of the permanent statutes is in the exact language of this amendment except one word, and that word does not change the meaning. Now, if the Chair will permit me, I will read the statute, and the Chair may read the amendment and see whether or not it follows the act:

Sec. 639. Purchase and distribution of seeds and plants: Purchase and distribution of vegetable, field, and flower seeds, plants, shrubs, vines, bulbs, and cuttings shall be of the freshest and best obtainable varieties and adapted to general cultivation. The Secretary of Agriculture, after due advertisement and on competitive bids, is authorized to award the contract for the supplying of printed packets and envelopes and the packeting, assembling, and mailing of the seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, or any part thereof, for a period of not more than five years nor less than one year, if by such action he can best protect the interests of the United States.

I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the amendment which has heretofore been held out of order—the one held on one occasion by the Speaker of the House out of order—was a wholly different amendment from this. It did not follow this language. It deviated from this language in many particulars. I should like for the Chair to peruse the statute on this subject. Now I call the attention of the Chair to another statute, a permanent statute. I hold in my hand the compilation of statutes that was compiled under the direction of the gentleman from Kansas, chairman of the Committee on the Revision and Codification of the Laws, and it contains this language, identical with the language I have quoted from Barnes as the permanent statutes of the United States. Article 808 in the new revision states, among the duties of the Department of Agriculture:

The purchase and distribution of vegetable, field, and flower seeds, plants, shrubs, vines, bulbs, and cuttings shall be of the freshest and best obtainable varieties and adapted to general cultivation.

Mr. ASWELL. A point of order. Can not we have the attention of the Chair to this argument?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. That is all right; I am not criticizing the Chair, because I know he is getting very good information from the gentleman from Oklahoma, and I am not complaining, but I want to quote the exact statute. Here is the language of the statute compiled by the committee on the compilation of the laws. Article 808:

The purchase and distribution of vegetable, field, and flower seeds, plants, shrubs, vines, bulbs, and cuttings shall be of the freshest and best obtainable varieties and adapted to general cultivation.

Now, article 809 says:

The Secretary of Agriculture, after due advertisement and on competitive bids, is authorized to award the contract for the supplying of printed packets and envelopes and the packeting, assembling, and mailing of seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, or any part thereof, for a period of not more than five years nor less than one year, if by such action he can best protect the interests of the United States.

Article 770 of this same compilation, in defining the duties of the Department of Agriculture, says:

And to procure, propagate, and distribute among the people new and valuable seeds and plants.

Now, if the Chair pleases, so far as that clause authorizing the Secretary to make a contract for five years, I may say that is the statute, that is already the statute. That practice is followed by the Government in building battleships, authorizing contracts extending over long periods of years. It is followed in the Treasury Department in the erection of public buildings, and it is followed in many of the Government departments, in the construction of roads and in the construction of all public works. So it is not for the Chair to say whether the statute is constitutional or not, but it is only for the Chair to decide whether or not that is the statute, and I would like to exhibit to the Chair, if I may, these acts so he can verify them.

Mr. BLANTON. We are entitled to know what is going on ourselves.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Texas has finished I would like to argue the point of order. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana is as follows:

Insert "purchase and distribution of vegetable, field and flower seeds, plants, shrubs, vines, bulbs, cuttings of the forests."

And so forth.

So far that is the language of the law. The first paragraph of the amendment cites the law. Then the amendment follows, after "\$360,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary":

The Secretary of Agriculture, after due advertisement and on competitive bids, is authorized to award the contract for the supplying of printed packets and envelopes, and the packeting, assembling, and mailing of seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, or any part thereof, for a period of not more than five years nor less than one year, if by such action he can best protect the interests of the United States.

Now, Mr. Chairman, all of this second part of the amendment is new legislation and is not authorized by law.

Mr. ASWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. ASWELL. That is the exact language of the law.

Mr. MADDEN. No; not the second part.

Mr. ASWELL. Absolutely.

Mr. MADDEN. It is not authorized by law.

Mr. ASWELL. I can show the gentleman the language exactly.

Mr. MADDEN. The appropriations are not authorized for five years.

Mr. ASWELL. This does not authorize an appropriation for five years.

Mr. MADDEN. This authorizes the letting of contracts for five years, which necessitates an appropriation. It provides an obligation against the Government which involves an appropriation. Now, Mr. Chairman, it is not germane to the bill nor any part of the bill, in my judgment.

It is a change of law beyond doubt, and since the rules of the House prohibit the enactment of substantive legislation on an appropriation bill I maintain that the amendment of the gentleman is not in order.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, may I submit this one suggestion?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. That latter part that provides for the contract is simply a repetition of existing law. It does not add anything to it. That part could be stricken out of the amendment, if necessary, without curtailing its operation at all. It is merely a repetition of existing law.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, let me suggest to the Chair a certain matter; I do not know whether the Chair has noticed it or not. I have looked through this bill, and I can not find anywhere a provision for the distribution of seeds except that paragraph on page 28 of the bill which provides for the purchase and distribution of certain rare seeds. It seems to me that this, being under the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, is on a different subject. If this amendment had been proper, it ought to have been offered to that portion of the bill where the purchase and distribution of seeds is taken care of. That portion has been passed. Gentlemen sat here without offering it.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. ASWELL. I call attention to the fact that this follows that paragraph which teaches people the use of food. It teaches them of something to grow.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. That may be an argument on the merits of the proposition, Mr. Chairman, but it certainly is not an argument in favor of its being in order at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL] offers the following amendment:

Purchase and distribution of vegetable, field, and flower seeds, plants, shrubs, vines, bulbs, and cuttings of the freshest and best obtainable varieties adapted to general cultivation, \$360,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary. The Secretary of Agriculture, after due advertisement and on competitive bids, is authorized to award the contract for the supply of printed packets and envelopes and the packeting, assembling, and mailing of the seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, or any part thereof, for a period of not more than five years nor less than one year, if by such action he can best protect the interests of the United States.

To the amendment the point of order is made that the amendment is not germane, that the amendment proposes legislation on an appropriation bill and appropriates for an object unauthorized by law.

The Revised Statutes, sections 526-527, provide:

The Commissioner of Agriculture * * * shall collect new and valuable seeds and plants; * * * and shall distribute them among agriculturists.

The purchase and distribution of seeds by the Department of Agriculture shall be confined to such seeds as are rare and uncommon to the country, or such as can be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our own country to another; and the purchase or propagation and distribution of trees, plants, shrubs, vines, and cuttings shall be confined to such as are adapted to general cultivation and to promote the general interests of horticulture and agriculture throughout the United States.

The Chair believes that in the proper place in this bill this amendment would have been in order. However, the paragraph under consideration is—

For acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with the marketing, handling, utilization, grading, transportation, and distributing—

and so forth, and the Chair holds that the amendment proposing to distribute seeds is not germane to the paragraph. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, with profound respect to the Chair and in view of the fact that another distinguished chairman has twice submitted this question to the committee, I most respectfully appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Would the Chair hold that this amendment would be in order at the end of the bill as an independent section?

Mr. MADDEN. That is not in order.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the statute the department has the right to purchase seeds. But there was a better place in the bill where, in the opinion of the Chair, the purchase would be germane. But the Chair rules that at this point it is not germane.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Illinois made the point that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eighteen Members—a quorum—are present.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana appeals from the decision of the Chair. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] to take the chair.

Mr. TILSON assumed the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the committee?

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. ASWELL. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana calls for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 57, noes 42.

The CHAIRMAN. On this vote the ayes are 57 and the noes are 42; so the decision of the Chair stands as the judgment of the committee.

Mr. ASWELL. I ask for tellers, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Tellers are demanded.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. MAGEE of New York, and Mr. ASWELL to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 79, noes 46.

The CHAIRMAN. On this vote the ayes are 79 and the noes are 46; and the decision of the Chair stands as the judgment of the committee. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For collecting, compiling, abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, interpreting, and publishing data relating to agriculture, including crop and livestock estimates, acreage, yield, grades, stock, and value of farm crops, and numbers, grades, and value of livestock and livestock prod-

acts on farms, in cooperation with the Extension Service and other Federal, State, and local agencies, \$409,960: *Provided*, That \$65,000 shall be available for collecting and disseminating to American producers, importers, exporters, and other interested persons information relative to the world supply of and need for American agricultural products, marketing methods, conditions, prices, and other factors, a knowledge of which is necessary to the advantageous disposition of such products in foreign countries, independently and in cooperation with other branches of the Government, State agencies, purchasing and consuming organizations, and persons engaged in the transportation, marketing, and distribution of farm and food products, including the purchase of such books and periodicals as may be necessary in connection with this work: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be available for any expense incident to ascertaining, collating, or publishing a report stating the intentions of farmers as to the acreage to be planted in cotton.

Mr. DOWELL resumed the chair.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. This section of the bill provides for the payment of agricultural commissioners and attachés who go to foreign countries and seek to find a market for our agricultural products. New and better markets for the products of the American farm is the thing that in my judgment is most essential to a restoration of agricultural prosperity.

I find this bill provides for the payment of something like \$10,000,000 for agricultural experts of one sort and another to assist the farmer in production. But the farmer, in my opinion, needs but little instruction so far as the production of agricultural products is concerned. The vital thing that confronts him now is the securing of a profitable market for his products. I think sometimes that the agricultural expert who comes to the farmer to teach him how to increase production may work him an injury rather than a benefit. The problem that confronts the wheat farmer now is the fact that we produce more of that product than we consume. The result is we must accept the foreign price, which is unprofitable to the American farmer.

About every fact of value to the farmer in his business of food production has been discovered by the farmer himself. The agricultural expert learns of something that the farmer has known ever since the days of Abraham and then tells him about it in language that he can not understand. The farmer himself is the greatest and only agricultural expert in the world.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. He is a good deal like the reformer who is talking about something that somebody else has been doing all his life.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes. Then we call him an expert because he talks in more or less complicated language about those things which the farmer had long before learned from the greatest teacher of all, Mother Nature.

But here is a provision of this bill which is intended to provide agents of the Government to find a market for the products of the farmer. That is where he needs expert help. After, by industry and intelligence, he has produced a crop he must find a market.

Now, we had a bill here the other day—I think introduced by the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. KETCHAM—that authorized the appropriation of money to increase the number of men who go to other lands, to find a market for agricultural products. I am glad to know it passed, and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has reported a bill—and is soon, I hope, to have it before the House—to increase the number of commercial attachés of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce who will be sent to other countries seeking to find markets for our products.

As an illustration of what may be done by such commercial agents, I want to tell the House, for its information, of something that came to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce a short time ago dealing with this very subject. A fact I was not aware of, until this report was made to our committee by the president of the California Rice Growers' Association, is that the greatest agricultural crop that is grown by man as a food product is not wheat, nor corn, nor rye, nor oats, but it is rice. Rice is the greatest in the volume of production and in the value of the product of any food grain crop that grows out of the ground. There are many, many millions of dollars' worth of rice grown in this country.

About three years ago, following the war and when the deflation of agriculture was brought about, the rice growers of California found themselves with a surplus of over 4,000,000 sacks of rice and no market for their rice. The business men of California who had furnished credit to these men were faced with bankruptcy because the rice growers could not pay their debts, and the banks that had furnished credit to these men were confronted with disaster, and apparently there was no market to be found for this rice. Then these men appealed to the foreign attachés of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, and in 40 days, gentlemen, this department had solved the problem for the rice growers of California. They found a market for that rice where we would have, perhaps, least thought such a market would be found. They did not find it in the East and South, where it would have had to compete with the rice growers in the South and East; nor did they find it in Europe, but they found it in Asia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. They found in Japan a market for their rice, with the result that in 1922 they sold to a country where we had never sold any rice before 148,000,000 pounds of rice, and uncovered there the greatest foreign market for rice we have ever been able to find. The volume of rice now exported to Japan from San Francisco is greater than that exported from the great port of New York, and greater than the export of rice from the southern port of New Orleans, although those two ports had exported rice for over 60 years. The result was that the rice growers of California were enabled to pay their debts, the banks were relieved, and prosperity came to those people who had been confronted with bankruptcy.

Now, the thing which impressed me about this report which was brought to us from the rice growers of California was that it all turned upon a thing seemingly small in substance but great in the results that flowed from it. It developed that there are three principal kinds of rice in the world—the long-grained rice, which is grown in the South and southern countries of America; the short-grained rice, grown in India; and the round-grained rice, which is the kind grown in California. It seems that the manner of cooking rice is essential to its being appreciated as food and is a great factor in finding a satisfactory market for it. When the American housewives of the East and South prepared the rice that was grown in California as they were taught to cook it they could not produce a food that was palatable or acceptable to the family that must eat it. It further developed that at the time we were trying to find a market for this California rice there were rice riots going on in Japan, not because there was not enough rice there but because the rice which supplied the annual deficiency in rice in that country was shipped to Japan from India, from Burma, and from Siam, where they grow the short-grained rice. So that when the Japanese housewife cooked her rice according to the cookbook rules of Japan that rice would not respond to her cooking, and the consequence was that she got mad about the rice and the way it performed; the husband was disgusted at his food and scolded the cook, quarreled with his wife, and at last went out on the street and threw a brick through some one's window, and as a consequence there was trouble in the home, threatened overthrow of the Government, and rice riots all over Japan.

Then came the attaché from America and convinced the people of Japan, and the housewives of Japan in particular, that the round-grain rice of California would respond to the cooking of the cooks of Japan, which it did, with the result that we now have the greatest foreign market for rice we have been able to find in the world, all as a result of the work of the commercial attaché, who by being on the ground and understanding the situation was able to solve it to the advantage of everybody.

This shows that, after all, gentlemen, we can change the trade currents of the world, we can change treaties, we can make new laws, but we can not change the laws and rules of the cooks of the world. And I will say in closing, gentlemen, that as I read of the differences we are having with Japan about restricted immigration and alien ownership of land, I want to express the hope that the housewives of Japan and the rice growers of California have woven a bond of mutual sympathy and common interest between our two na-

tions so strong that neither the warrior nor the statesman will be able to break it. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

For enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate and certify to shippers and other interested parties the quality and condition of fruits, vegetables, poultry, butter, hay, and other perishable farm products when offered for interstate shipment or when received at such important central markets as the Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time designate, or at points which may be conveniently reached therefrom, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, including payment of such fees as will be reasonable and as nearly as may be to cover the cost for the service rendered: *Provided*, That certificates issued by the authorized agents of the departments shall be received in all courts of the United States as prima facie evidence of the truth of the statements therein contained, \$308,000, of which \$5,000 shall be immediately available.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments and I will ask that they both be read at once as they involve the same subject matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the Clerk will read the amendments offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. BUCHANAN: On page 55, line 2, after the word "the" insert the word "class"; then on page 55, line 3, after the word "of" insert the words "cotton and"; and on page 55, line 14, strike out the figures "\$308,000" and in lieu thereof insert the figures "\$333,000."

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, this subject is very important to the agricultural interests of the United States. Not until two years ago did Congress by enactment undertake to set up a governmental agency of experts, qualified men in line with their business engagements, to act as an impartial classifier of a few of the agricultural products of the United States.

The service does not cost the taxpayer, because it provides that an inspection fee shall be charged to meet the cost of the service. Last year 100,000 cars of fruits and vegetables under this provision were inspected, and but 77 objections were made to the inspection and only 37 of them were not sustained. Seventy-two thousand carloads were inspected at shipping points where the products are loaded on the car, and \$12,500 was appropriated by the Federal Congress. The balance of \$280,000 was assumed and appropriated by the States, all of which was reimbursed by the inspection fees of the service.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Is this a standard fee?

Mr. BUCHANAN. It is a regulation of the department. They have been charging \$4 per car. If they charged \$5 they would make a big profit out of it.

In the inspection of fruits and vegetables in Arkansas or Colorado—I do not remember which—the Government inspected thousands of carload shipments, and when the season was over the Government had realized a profit of \$1,000 on the operation. I do not think the Government ought to realize a profit. It is a public service. It ought to be provided by the Government of the United States without profit for all the agricultural products of the Nation, for they constitute a national interest. I do not mean it to apply to fruits and vegetables only, as now provided, but to whatever enters into interstate or foreign commerce. We can well afford to set up an impartial governmental agency that has no interest in selling the product; an agency that has no interest in the man who buys the product and is authorized to inspect and certify to class and quality of the product and then give a certificate to that effect under the terms of the law, which certificate is prima facie evidence in all the courts of the United States as to the class and quality therein stated.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I know of some instances in my district or close by where they have used these certificates under this system and it has been very beneficial to the shipper, because it has protected him against claims of commission men and others that the product was under quality when, in fact, it was really of standard quality.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Absolutely; in other words, in the few agricultural products covered by this section now, the dishonest commission man, who has been swindling the farmer out of his products on quality and on class, has been put out of business. Not only that, but any merchant or any dealer

who is honest wants to buy only the class he orders. He does not want to get the best of it.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I do not know much about cotton, and this amendment is for the purpose of including cotton and having it subject to inspection. How many commercial varieties of cotton are there, as to quality and grading, and so on?

Mr. BUCHANAN. In the standards prescribed by the Department of Agriculture there are 20 boxes, each holding 9 white and 11 colored standard grades. These have now been accepted by all the cotton purchasers as the standards of the world in the cotton trade. These standards are based only on two factors—the color of the cotton and the absence of foreign matter; that is, the quantity of trash in it. The length of the staple and the strength of the staple are not considered in these standards at all, but the length of the staple and the strength of the staple—fiber—are the most valuable qualities in cotton.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Would the gentleman mind explaining just how this would work with reference to cotton, according to the gentleman's idea?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes; I will do that if I get the time; but let me first finish this other discussion.

Under this system of inspection at shipping points and terminals which has been in operation two years, let me tell you how it has operated and then you can understand better how it will operate on cotton. During the past year a system has grown up known as the auction system by reason of this service. What is it? A producer in California would load a carload of oranges or a carload of cantaloupes or a carload of cabbage or whatever he produces out there—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 10 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas may proceed for 10 additional minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The producer will load his car in California, request a Federal inspector, who inspects the contents of the car and gives him a certificate of quality and grade, which is immediately wired to auction companies in New York, Chicago, Boston, Philadelphia, and other large cities, and by which such company immediately sells the carload of produce at auction on the Government certificate alone. The farmer or producer who loads the car gets his money before the car leaves the State of California or by the time it gets a few hundred miles away.

Now, how will it operate with cotton, the gentleman asks? A cotton mill in Massachusetts or foreign country will advertise in the papers of the South, or send a telegram to some industrial organization, chamber of commerce, or farm cooperative association, saying:

Wanted, 10,000 bales of middling cotton, length of staple, 1½ inch; strength of staple, No. 1. Government certificate as to class and quality required.

This will reach the farmers who have cotton in the warehouse or cooperative organizations, who, having had their cotton inspected, classified, and certified by this governmental agency, and therefore know the grade and value of their cotton, will wire back, "Will fill your order for so much a pound." Your trade is made, and five or six middlemen are eliminated. Not only that, but the farmer gets the actual value of his cotton. Why? You gentlemen in the noncotton-producing States do not understand what is required to classify cotton. It takes years of study and experience to graduate an "expert classifier." The farmer does not know the quality of his cotton. He can not know it without years of study and experience, for which he has no time. It takes all his time to raise his cotton, so that the farmer is at the mercy of the cotton buyers as to the value of his cotton, both as to class and price. It is rather paradoxical that the farmer is the only large element of our population, constituting the foundation of all our financial and industrial enterprises, raising the products to feed and clothe the Nation, who has no say in fixing the price and class of his own products; and, what is still worse, those who buy his products fix the class and price, contrary to all principles of honest and fair commercial dealing in other industrial and commercial enterprises.

With this governmental service of inspection, classification, and certification at his command, he will be fully informed of the valuable marketable factors of his cotton; that is, color, absence of foreign matter, length and strength of staple, and other valuable spinning factors that may be essential in a quality of a special type or class of cotton produced.

With this knowledge, he can demand and receive its just value. He will be placed on an equal footing with the cotton buyer. This the cotton farmer has the right to demand. He asks nothing more.

To illustrate the number of middlemen who live and profit upon the cotton farmer's toil, let me cite you to an actual illustration which occurred just before the war under the administration of Mr. Redfield, Secretary of Commerce of the United States, and which is recorded in the hearings of the Appropriations Committee.

Through the Commerce Department during the Redfield administration a foreign attaché of that department ascertained that a Russian mill wanted to purchase 40,000 bales of cotton. This trade opportunity was advertised in one of the publications of the Commerce Department.

The Russian mill bought the cotton from a Russian broker, who bought it from a German cotton broker. The German cotton broker bought the cotton from an English cotton broker. The English cotton broker bought the cotton from an American cotton broker, the American cotton broker bought the cotton from the local cotton buyer in the South, and the local cotton buyer bought the cotton from the merchants, and the merchants bought the cotton from the farmer.

Mr. MADDEN. And the farmer can not know the grade of his wheat or corn.

Mr. BUCHANAN. True; as I said to the gentleman from Illinois, this service will come; it is manifest destiny that this service will ultimately take in every agricultural product in the United States that enters interstate commerce. It ought to be in grain; you have supervision of grain and inspection, but you have not the Government certification that you ought to have. It will eventually take in every agricultural product.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I think the twenty-odd thousand dollars the gentleman is asking for will do the farmers of the country more good than all of the \$6 an acre which Congress has been setting a precedent by lending them on the land.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I agree with the gentleman. A week ago I introduced a bill covering every agricultural product entering into interstate and foreign commerce, including livestock, and that bill has the approval of the bureau administering the law. I have had requests from various sections of the country asking for a copy of the bill. But before I conclude I want to read you what has been said by men who have had experience with the Federal inspection and certification service. This is from the Valley Fruit Co., wholesalers, Walla Walla, Wash., December, 1923:

To sum up briefly, we find that the State and Federal inspection is working out about as follows:

First. It is teaching the farmer standardization.

One of the most important things yet to be attained in the interest of agriculture is the standardization of agricultural products; that is, the establishment of standard grades according to marketable value of each agricultural product and acceptance by the people of such standardized grades. When this has been accomplished, each farmer will strive to produce what will be classed in the higher and more valuable standardized grades, and thus by process of evolution the inferior types of agricultural products will be eliminated, and only the best types will be cultivated and placed upon the market.

But to continue the statement of the Valley Fruit Co.:

Second. Improving the quality of the offerings of perishable produce.

Third. Eliminating an enormous waste by reason that inferior produce is not finding its way to the market at the expense of the consumer.

Fourth. It protects the buyer, for he can now safely purchase produce at most any point within the United States, with the assurance he will get what his contract specifies.

Fifth. It protects the producer, for he is no longer at the mercy of the unscrupulous dealer.

Sixth. The honest producer, the conscientious dealer, and the consumer all get a fair deal.

Seventh. The inspection certificate is an unbiased and disinterested witness of the quality and condition of merchandise at the time and place of inspection, and serves to iron out friendly differences arising within the trade that, prior to the enactment of this legislation, quite often resulted in expensive litigation.

The great value of governmental inspection, grading, and certification of all agricultural products, in the protection given the producer and consumer, is inestimable and undisputed. The brief period of its application has won unstinted recognition and praise. But to cotton, the great textile commodity of mankind, is due specific notice and distinctive consideration, because it has afforded by its peculiar character a unique opportunity for the ever vigilant and rapacious middleman, and that favored class has too long preyed and prospered upon the unprotected victim of governmental neglect.

When the gantlet of the planter has been run and he has laid by his crop and defeated the hordes of voracious and destructive insects, has ginned and weighed and sampled his bales, and wonders and waits the final reward, he must ignorantly accept the appraisal and payment by the interested, unscrupulous, and cold-blooded agencies of the market. Whatever the dictum of the intermediaries which, without explanation, determines the price and disposes of his full year of sacrifice, he must accept it without negotiation and without the opportunity of appeal.

It is my ambition, and I am anxious to be instrumental through this amended bill to cooperate with the cotton farmer in producing a cotton, standardized by seed, culture, preparation, and marketing procedures, that will enable him to realize for himself his full and true measure in the sale of the commodity produced by his own ingenuity and hard work. It is his most righteous reward for the sacrifice of his time and the wear and tear of his faculties, and he ought to enjoy a fair and ample remuneration.

If the cotton planter can negotiate the entire marketing of his own husbandry and profit equitably, as he deserves, the advancement of his own and the common welfare will be a surprise, for the middlemen, who live and fatten by handling the great staple, are parasites who contribute nothing to the common good but derive for selfish purposes the sustenance which, by every essential right, should go to the interest of "the man with the hoe," whose time and toil extracted it from the bosom of Mother Earth.

The advisable governmental inspection, State and Federal, has borne satisfactory proof, beyond the peradventure of a doubt; and its pronounced value is attested by the indorsement of the growers and localities who have experienced its blessing. The Secretary of Agriculture sees in it an indispensable benefit. Many of the fruit and vegetable growers of the State of Washington and elsewhere have testified in forceful terms indorsing the governmental inspection and praying for continuance and increase of appropriations. These and all perishable products have benefited by the Federal interest in their behalf. Cotton, though not of the perishable class, has troubles all its own, and its pleadings are patent and intensive. If an enactment and appropriation as set forth in this amended bill were in force, and the cotton grower could sell his cotton directly to the manufacturer and consumer, the great cost of manipulation by the selfish agencies of the market would be saved to the producer, who is entitled to the right to price his own product and enjoy its richest reward.

Mr. Chairman, according to the last census there are 105,710,620 people in the United States. Of this number 31,614,269 are living on the farms. Of those living on the farms there are 8,138,070 under 10 years of age, and 7,828,106 between 10 and 20 years of age; thus you will see that 15,966,177 of the farm population are minors under 20 years of age, who, we all agree, should be in school preparing for the trials and tribulations of life. Subtracting this minor element of the farm population from the total farm population leaves 15,652,090 adults living on the farm. One-half of these are women and should not be compelled to do manual labor, which leaves 7,826,046 adult males living on the farm. Of this number, at least one and one-half million are in their declining years, too old for great manual labor. This will leave 6,326,046 able-bodied men engaged in gainful farm operations.

Statistics show that there are 1,000,000 more people moving from the farm to the city each year than there are from the city to the farm. What will be the ultimate result of the continuation of this process under our industrial system and economic laws no man can safely predict.

One thing, however, is certain; we should by effort of head, hand, and heart strive to aid the agricultural interests of the Nation and better the conditions of those who are engaged therein by passing every constructive piece of legislation that will reasonably tend to equalize the opportunities of the farmer with the other classes of our citizenship.

The burdens of government should rest equally upon the shoulders of all, and its blessings, like the dews of heaven, should descend alike upon the heads of all.

My bill and my amendment is one little step in the right direction. Let us approve them and take all future steps to promote and safeguard the agricultural interests of the Nation consistent with the fundamental principles of our representative democracy.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, as I understand, this service, rendered as stated by the gentleman, has been very satisfactory, and I agree in the views of my distinguished colleague from Texas and hope that his amendment will be adopted.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, two years ago I prepared and offered an amendment to the appropriation bill providing for Federal inspection of perishable farm products at shipping point. You may recall that my amendment had but few friends and was strenuously opposed at that time by those who could not see that it was a practical solution of the fruit growers', the berry growers', and the truck farmers' big problem. However, after vigorous debate the amendment was adopted and has been carried in the bill from year to year since.

Those in Congress who scoffed at Federal inspection then are pleading for it now.

It has proven a great success as we predicted at that time. More than 7,200 cars were inspected at shipping points in 1922 and all but 27 stood final tests in eastern markets. That shows the remarkable efficiency of this service.

It costs the shipper but 25 or 50 cents in addition to State inspection.

I want you to know what the growers and shippers themselves think of it. This information will be of great benefit to Congress and to shippers throughout the country.

WORTH MILLION DOLLARS TO THE FRUIT GROWERS

Some of the big shippers have said that this thing was worth a million dollars to the fruit growers of the State of Washington because of its preventing suits in distant cities when the market has dropped or a question has arisen as to whether fruit has arrived in good condition; and if it was not in good condition, whether it was the fault of the railroad company or the fault of the shipper. So they consider it very valuable and, as performing a function which the State inspection can not perform because a State inspection certificate has no legal status beyond the borders of the State in which it is issued.

The Yakima Fruit Growers' Association, Yakima, Wash., December 19, 1923, say:

All the shippers of Washington, especially the two large fruit shipping districts, look on this service as one of the longest steps forward which the Government has taken in assisting in the distribution of foodstuffs during recent years.

From the Associated Fruit Co., general distributors of fruits and vegetables, Yakima Valley district office, Yakima, Wash., December 21, 1923:

The coming of Federal inspection to the shippers and growers of this valley marks a new era in the shipping of perishables, and had we not been protected by its benefits this season, I dare say that the rejections due to a falling market would have been ten times greater. It would be a hard blow to the growers and shippers if the United States Government decided to discontinue this service inasmuch as we have become accustomed to picking and shipping under its regulations. It would simply mean that the fruit industry would go backward instead of progressing.

From the Valley Fruit Co. (Inc.), wholesalers, Walla Walla, Wash., December 18, 1923:

To sum up briefly, we find that the State and Federal inspection is working out about as follows: First, it is teaching the farmer standardization; second, improving the quality of the offerings of perishable produce; third, eliminating an enormous waste, by reason that inferior produce is not finding its way to the market at the expense of the consumer; fourth, it protects the buyer, for he can now safely purchase produce at most any point within the United States, with the assurance he will get what his contract specifies; fifth, it protects the producer, for he is no longer at the mercy of the unscrupulous dealer; sixth, the honest producer, the conscientious dealer and the consumer, all get a fair deal; seventh, the inspection certificate is an unbiased and disinterested witness of the quality and condition of the merchandise at the time and place of inspection, and serves to iron out friendly differences arising within the trade that prior to the enactment of this legislation quite often resulted in expensive litigation.

From Benz Bros. & Co., car-lot shippers, fruits, hay, and grain, potatoes and onions, Toppenish, Wash., December 17, 1923:

As far as the farmer is concerned, this service makes it easier for him to sell at reasonable prices inasmuch as the dealer to whom he sells need not figure for himself wide margins of profit to cover losses arising from rejections. This at least is the way the thing operates in the Yakima Valley.

From the Puget Sound Berry Growers' Association, producers of Marshall strawberries, Seattle, Wash., December 15, 1923:

The elimination of distrust alone in our case and it must be in thousands of others in the same position does more for the good feeling between buyer and shipper than anything else, and to take away Government inspection would bring back the old-time distrustful feeling that existed between shipper and receiver.

From Lloyd Garretson Co., growers and shippers of fruit and produce, Yakima, Wash., January 28, 1924:

There can be no doubt that this is one Government service in connection with the distribution of perishable farm products that is of real value. It is the only impartial way that there can be furnished a clear and acceptable report of the condition which in fact represents the value of these products when they are turned over to the transportation company for shipment; hence the only method of establishing value without dispute. We hope that the time will come when no labeled product of the Northwest will be permitted to be removed to market unless they are covered by Federal certificates of inspection.

From the Perham Fruit Co., buyers and shippers of Northwest fruits, Yakima, Wash., December 17, 1923:

Nothing has happened in the fruit and vegetable industry in many years that has had a tendency to stabilize and standardize our products as has this Federal inspection, and it has placed our business on a very much safer basis than heretofore.

From the Winthrop Fruit Co., handlers of fruits and growers' supplies, Yakima, Wash., December 17, 1923:

We are heartily in favor of your upholding the continuance of this service, as we ourselves use the Federal inspection on the majority of the shipments of both soft fruits and apples from this territory. It is very essential for the industry here, in view of the fact that we are so far from eastern markets that it is very necessary to establish the true condition of our fruits without question at time of shipment.

From John R. Hartman, of the law firm of Hartman & Hartman, Seattle, Wash., December 18, 1923:

What you are doing is striking directly at the root of the evil, which is excessive charges that the middlemen have been able to add to the agricultural product between the producers' shipping point and the consumers' receiving place. You will be fought very hard by this intervening and perfectly arranged organization, and possibly through its manipulation of facts some producers and consumers may join them. You will be kept steadily on the job and I am sure will win. Let me help you.

From Richey & Gilbert Co., Yakima Valley fruits, Yakima, Wash., December 17, 1923:

It would be a very serious step backward if the Government were to reduce or withdraw this service. We believe the Government inspection of perishable shipments has done more and is doing more to put the shipment of perishables on a stable basis than has been accomplished through any other medium.

From the Earl Fruit Co., northwest division, packers and distributors of northwestern fruits and vegetables, Spokane, Wash., December 17, 1923:

We have availed ourselves to a considerable extent of Federal shipping-point inspection and are strongly in favor of its continuance. We will handle annually about 3,000 cars of perishable fruit and vegetables from Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, and am safe in saying that 50 per cent of these shipments have been inspected at shipping point.

From A. G. Craig, grower and shipper of "Donkey" brand apples, East Farms, Wash., December 17, 1923:

This inspection has simplified many of the difficulties of marketing fruit. It is not only a protection to the shipper but it is also a protection to the honest buyer.

From the Walla Walla Gardeners' Association, Walla Walla, Wash., December 28, 1923:

We wish to commend you on the success of Federal inspection at shipping point. We certainly approve of this Federal inspection, and only trust that it will be strengthened and not weakened.

From the Highland Apple Co., Underwood, Wash., December 27, 1923:

We consider it one of the best pieces of legislation which has been enacted for the benefit of northwestern fruit growers, and would be very sorry to see any change made.

From the Yakima Valley Traffic and Credit Association, Yakima, Wash., January 14, 1924:

The growers and shippers of Yakima Valley are vitally concerned in this matter, and since the service is self-supporting there does not seem to be any good reason why it should not be continued.

Federal inspection at shipping point, as provided by my amendment to the appropriation bill two years ago, has proved of great value to growers, shippers, and consumers, and should be put into more general operation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the first amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 55, line 2, after the word "the," insert the word "class"; page 55, line 3, after the word "of," insert "cotton and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the other amendment of the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 55, line 14, strike out the figures "\$308,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$333,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For collecting, publishing, and distributing, by telegraph, mail, or otherwise, timely information on the market supply and demand, commercial movement, location, disposition, quality, condition, and market prices of livestock, meats, fish, and animal products, dairy and poultry products, fruits and vegetables, peanuts and their products, grain, hay, feeds, and seeds, and other agricultural products, independently and in cooperation with other branches of the Government, State agencies, purchasing and consuming organizations, and persons engaged in the production, transportation, marketing, and distribution of farm and food products, \$682,480.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BEGG: Page 56, line 12, after the word "products," strike out the figures "\$682,480," and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$742,480."

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, it is not often that I offer an amendment to increase an appropriation of any kind, but I have been convinced beyond any question of doubt that this money is needed, if any of the \$682,000 is needed. I do not mean by that at all that I think any of it ought to be stricken out, but if it is worth while to spend \$682,000 annually for the purpose of furnishing the dairy market report to the livestock producers of this country, and the \$682,000 fails to be a sufficient amount to get that report and information out of the five big market centers in the eastern territory, then it is justifiable to offer an increase of \$60,000 to provide that service.

I have no criticism to make of the committee at all. It is impossible for the committee to get all of the information that there is about everything. My criticism is not leveled toward the committee, but I do believe that whoever is responsible for the information that should be furnished to the committee on an article or item as important as the livestock report for the cooperative societies of this country, that individual or organization has failed in his duty.

For information I want to read the organizations representing the farmers who are interested in this amendment and want it incorporated in the bill. I give the committee this information not with a view to convincing or changing their minds but solely with a view to showing that the interest in this item of \$60,000 was spontaneous, because I say to my friends on the committee that I have not written a letter nor telephoned to a soul in respect to it. Every one of these communications came to me, and I am merely the agency that has to present them to the House. With the permission of the committee I shall insert these communications in the Record at this point, because they are all short, the majority of them being five and six line communications. They are from the Department of Agriculture, the Ohio Farm Bureau, the Ohio State Grange, the Indiana Farm Bureau, the Pennsylvania Farm Bureau, the Iowa Farm Bureau, the Michigan Farm Bureau, the New York State Grange, the West Virginia Farm Bureau, the Na-

tional Farm Bureau, the Illinois Agricultural Association, the Michigan Livestock Exchange, the Ohio Livestock Cooperative Association, the National Livestock Producers' Association of Chicago, and the National Grange, and they are as follows:

COLUMBUS, OHIO, April 21, 1924.

Hon. JAMES BEGG,

Member of Congress, District 13, Ohio, Washington, D. C.:

Last year we shipped 25,000 cattle, 50,000 calves, 125,000 sheep, and 634,000 hogs to markets, made and reported by middlemen themselves or their agencies. We seriously need Government reporting service which is accurate, complete, impartial, and honest. Same service furnished western farmers on small markets if provided large eastern markets will enable intelligent marketing and save us money. Prospects passage Begg amendment agricultural appropriation look good. Promises appreciated. Votes now required. Please be present and support amendment above. Wire to all Ohio Congressmen. Note our shipments 1923. Your efforts appreciated. Wire results.

F. G. KETNER, Ohio Farm Bureau.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,

Washington, April 19, 1924.

Mr. F. G. KETNER,

The Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, Columbus, Ohio.

DEAR MR. KETNER: I have your letter of April 14 in which you express the desire of livestock producers to have the Federal market news service extended to cover more of the eastern livestock markets, and also concerning my attitude toward a proposed amendment to the agricultural appropriation bill to provide for such service.

We recognize the importance of the eastern markets to which you refer, namely, Buffalo, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Cincinnati, and Indianapolis, which are now not included in our regular market news service on livestock and meats. During the war these markets were covered, but following the war the reduction of expenditures for market news service made it necessary to close the offices in these cities, and while appropriations for Market News Service have been increased from year to year since then, we have not been able to restore our offices at these points.

The addition of \$60,000 to which you refer, as provided by a proposed amendment, would enable us to establish the reporting service in at least some of these markets. The appropriation bill as reported to the House carries the Budget item of \$682,480 for market news service for the next fiscal year. This is a net reduction of \$26,100 below the amount provided for this year. It will be necessary, of course, to make some curtailment to meet this reduction. To maintain the present work, and also to open offices as you desire, would involve an increase in appropriations, which if made should probably first provide for the reduction from the current year and then for such new work as possible to be done.

Answering specifically your inquiry as to the department's attitude toward the amendment proposed, I will state that the extension you ask undoubtedly would be of service to the livestock producers in the region concerned and that the Department of Agriculture is in favor of extending this and similar useful services to the agricultural industry whenever the state of the national finances will permit. You understand, however, that the Budget figure is based upon consideration of the general financial situation of the Government as a whole. In view of the necessity for economy in governmental expenditures, which, under present Budget procedure, involves keeping the estimates of this and the other departments within a stipulated figure for each, the department is not in position to advocate increases for this and numerous other items of unquestioned merit, many of which would be urged if the fiscal situation were different. The present question, therefore, is one for Congress to determine. I do not need to state that the department stands ready to extend its market news service and any other useful service in which it is engaged as rapidly as Congress deems wise and in keeping with the general policy of economy.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY C. WALLACE, Secretary.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, April 18, 1924.

G. F. KETNER,

Care Harrington Hotel, Washington, D. C.:

Ohio State Grange recommends approval of Begg amendment providing market news service for eastern markets. State membership, 100,000.

C. A. DYER,

Chairman Executive Committee Ohio State Grange.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., April 18, 1924.

F. G. KETNER,

Care Gray Silver, American Farm Bureau,

Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.:

A very large proportion of Indiana livestock goes to markets without market news service. The Indiana Farm Bureau, speaking for more

than 60,000 of these producers, asks that they be granted this service at Indianapolis, Buffalo, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, and Cincinnati.

W. H. SETTLE.

HELLERTOWN, PA., April 18, 1924.

F. G. KETNER,
American Farm Bureau Federation, Munsey Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Pennsylvania Farm Bureau Federation, 5,000 members, strongly urges Federal market-news service. See Hon. EVERETT KENT, Congressman. Have wired him.

HOWARD MITTMAN, Treasurer.

IDAGROVE, IOWA, April 18, 1924.

F. G. KETNER,
Harrington Hotel, Washington, D. C.:

The Corn Belt Meat Producers' Association does hereby give their unqualified indorsement and support of an appropriation of \$60,000 by Congress for Government market-news service for eastern livestock markets.

A. SYKES, President.

LANSING, MICH., April 17, 1924.

F. G. KETNER,
Harrington Hotel, Washington, D. C.:

Michigan State Farm Bureau, representing 75,000 leading Michigan farmers, urges everything possible be done to secure passage of appropriation for market-news service, eastern markets. Favorable replies received to date from Congressmen KETCHAM and WOODRUFF.

MICHIGAN STATE FARM BUREAU.

CASTLE, N. Y., April 16, 1924.

F. G. KETNER,
Hotel Harrington, Washington, D. C.:

New York State Grange, representing 140,000, thoroughly approve appropriations for livestock-marketing field service.

S. L. STRIVINGS, State Master.

CHARLESTON, W. VA., April 18, 1924.

F. G. KETNER,
Care Gray Silver, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.:

Have communicated with number influential farm bureau members and livestock producers regarding Federal marketing-news service which would be provided by Begg amendment. The West Virginia Farm Bureau Federation, comprising more than 7,500 farmers, gives their hearty approval to this appropriation and urges Congress to give eastern farmers same consideration heretofore extended other markets.

J. B. McLAUGHLIN,

Secretary West Virginia Farm Bureau Federation.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., April 18, 1924.

Some years ago Congress decided that it was wise and necessary to establish livestock market-news services in the large livestock marketing centers. This was desirable because conditions had become such that a nonpartisan, unbiased market-news service was necessary. However, when the work was actually established the reporting service was put in only in the western markets. This is an injustice to the eastern markets, which are just as much entitled to a market-news service as the western. The United States Department of Agriculture intended this year to establish the service in the East, but it can not do this unless more money is appropriated for the work without discontinuing the valuable service in the West, which, of course, would not meet with the livestock interests. The State farm bureaus in the East, as well as the American Farm Bureau Federation, voicing the sentiment of many of its leaders, request Congress to provide in the appropriation for next year adequate funds for this work.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
GRAY SILVER, Washington Representative.

ILLINOIS AGRICULTURAL ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., April 16, 1924.

Our livestock farmers ship considerable livestock to the eastern stock markets. We are therefore very desirous of having the Government reporting service, on which we rely on our central market, established on the eastern markets to guide us in our consignment to those markets.

ILLINOIS AGRICULTURAL ASSOCIATION,
J. D. HARPER, Assistant Secretary.

DETROIT, MICH., April 16, 1924.

The 80,000 members of the Michigan Livestock Exchange respectfully plead for an appropriation sufficient to provide Federal market news service on our adjacent livestock markets, namely, Indianapolis, Cleveland, Buffalo, Pittsburgh, and Cincinnati.

The proper development of our cooperative livestock marketing program and the protection of the best interests of our producers require this accurate and impartial reporting service.

MICHIGAN LIVESTOCK EXCHANGE,
JOHN H. O'MEALY, Secretary.

OHIO LIVESTOCK COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Columbus, Ohio, April 18, 1924.

We have a very great need for the Federal livestock market news service on the major eastern markets. Our 60,000 livestock producer members respectfully request the extension to our major eastern markets of the service now available to the western farmers. The Federal market news service will furnish a complete, unbiased picture of the livestock markets we patronize. This we do not now have.

OHIO LIVESTOCK COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
E. T. TAYLOR, President.

OHIO FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Columbus, Ohio, April 19, 1924.

The Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, with a membership of 65,000 farmers, is intensely interested in having Federal livestock market news service provided on the larger eastern livestock markets. Intelligent livestock marketing makes necessary this accurate, impartial, and complete reporting service. Standardization, so essential to proper marketing, will be made possible by this uniform reporting service.

OHIO FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
L. B. PALMER, President.

NATIONAL LIVESTOCK PRODUCERS' ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., April 16, 1924.

Scientific and advantageous marketing of livestock depends largely on complete and accurate market information. Experience has demonstrated that the Government reporting service is thorough, impartial, and accurate. Livestock producers of the Central and Eastern States have need of and should be provided with the same Federal service furnished the producers of the Western States. This is particularly true of the Indianapolis, Cleveland, Buffalo, Pittsburgh, and Cincinnati markets, on which large volumes of livestock are marketed annually.

NATIONAL LIVESTOCK PRODUCERS' ASSOCIATION.

THE NATIONAL GRANGE, PATRONS OF HUSBANDRY,
OFFICE OF THE MASTER,
Columbus, Ohio, April 19, 1924.

Hon. JAMES T. BEGG,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BEGG: Allow me to call your attention to the need for better market reporting service for the livestock markets of Buffalo, Cleveland, Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, and Indianapolis.

I wish to assure you that any efforts which you can make to secure sufficient appropriation to conduct this service will be of value to the producers of livestock in this territory.

Yours very truly,

L. J. TABER,
Master the National Grange.

Every one of them has asked this Congress to put the \$60,000 in so that the service that is provided for with the \$682,000 in the western part of the United States will be available in Indianapolis, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Pittsburgh, and Buffalo.

What are some of the facts? If this service is worth the investment, it should be extended to the high points where the market is best for livestock east of the Mississippi. This service is available at Atlanta, Ga., but it is not available unless the \$60,000 be granted at Cleveland, Ohio. Nevertheless, Cleveland handles five times as many hogs, eight times as many sheep, and four times as many cattle as Atlanta. It is fair to deduce from those figures that there are practically fifteen times the farmers served out of the Cleveland stock market that there are out of the Atlanta. I submit that if the committee is justified in maintaining this service at Atlanta, it ought not to stand back on the prerogative that we have not come through the Budget in denying this service for a market that will benefit fifteen times as many producers. Buffalo, N. Y., has no service, and Salt Lake City has. Yet Buffalo has twice as many hogs, three times as many sheep, seven times as many cattle as Salt Lake. The same reasoning can be deduced as in the comparison with Cleveland and Atlanta. If the farmers who sell to the Salt Lake stock market reap a benefit from that money that is invested in putting out the daily market reports, available to the producer so that he will know where best to sell his product, then there will

be seven times the number of farmers benefited if this service is extended to Buffalo.

Mr. MADDEN rose.

Mr. BEGG. I will yield only when I am through. Indianapolis has no service, and Los Angeles has, yet Indianapolis, without this service handles twelve times as many hogs, twice as many sheep, twice as many cattle as Los Angeles. The same deductions can be made there. Pittsburgh has no service and Ogden has, yet Pittsburgh handles eleven times as many hogs, and just the same amount of sheep, and six times the number of cattle that Los Angeles does. Cincinnati has no service and Denver has, yet Cincinnati handles three times the number of hogs, but she handles only one-sixth of the number of sheep and one-half the number of cattle. Lest you think, perchance, that I am making this drive to help the livestock producers in Ohio, let me say to you that the statistics show that the State of Iowa marketed in Buffalo last year 300,000 head of hogs.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. Only when I am through with this statement. If the producers of hogs lost, we will say, 25 cents a hog by not knowing the best market in the United States to unload the hogs at, then the State of Iowa lost to the farmers of that State \$15,000 more than enough to supply this service in all five of the big centers of the United States east of the Mississippi River.

What percentage of the total stock coming into the market is handled by cooperative societies?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. I would rather finish first.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to continue for 10 minutes more.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, I must object to that. We have to get on with the bill.

Mr. BEGG. I have not had one minute of the time heretofore.

Mr. MADDEN. I shall not object to five minutes.

Mr. BEGG. Then I shall ask for five minutes more.

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Illinois ought not to close debate on the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MADDEN. There are others who are going to debate this question, but I shall not object to the 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that he may have 10 minutes.

Mr. BEGG. I would like to present this case, as I am convinced I am right in this.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I am going to answer the gentleman, and I would like for the gentleman to have full opportunity to present his side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has been granted five additional minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Ten minutes I said; I do not object.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio if he has the Supreme Court on this question?

Mr. MADDEN. But I object to any colloquy about it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the extension? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman and gentleman of the committee, I thank you for the indulgence, and I will not take any further time after that.

Now, with reference to cooperative societies. What percentage of the total sales of the livestock markets of the East do these societies furnish? The statistics of 1923 show in the eastern markets that they furnish about an average of 20 per cent of all the livestock that comes into these five eastern points brought in there by the cooperative organization. Now, the opponents of this measure, and our good friends on the committee, are going to argue they have this privilege now to use the daily market report, but my information from all these organizations, farmers' associations, the grange and cooperative market associations, is to the effect that if the cooperatives oversell the private commission house to-day to-morrow's report never mentions that fact, but if the cooperatives undersell, then the fact is blazoned forth in big type by the private commission house reports next day.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. I want to finish the statement.

Mr. MADDEN. I hope the gentleman will yield to the gentleman from Kansas, who is a farmer himself.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. I simply want to ask the gentleman from Ohio this question: Do the Government reports give the sales of cooperative associations?

Mr. BEGG. It does, wherever the service is furnished under this provision, and that is just exactly the thing I am trying to get the five eastern—

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. I never saw it.

Mr. BEGG. I can not help the fact the gentleman has never seen it. That is all this money is appropriated for. How do we get the service out of Pittsburgh, Cleveland, and all places where they do not have any Government agency for collecting this data? Why all these reports are collected by one private commission house and it is contributed to by all the other private concerns, and every one of them are driving against the cooperatives. Now, I do not claim to be the best friend of the farmer in this House, by the protestations I have heard on this floor, but I am just so good a friend that if I could subscribe to the doctrine like the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from New York, my good friend MAGEE, that we ought to exempt them from prosecutions under the law for organizing to control prices, I would go further and prove my sincerity and give them a square deal and not let the private commission houses kill them by unfair competition. The private houses have even resorted to what is known as the "mark-up price" in making their reports of sales, and thereby reporting fictitious and fraudulent sales from the private concerns as against the cooperatives in the daily market reports. My good friend MAGEE will tell you we are already getting this service radioed out of Washington daily. My answer to that is this: How can the Department of Agriculture radio yesterday's sales out of Pittsburgh, Buffalo, Cincinnati, Indianapolis, if there is no agency there to gather the data and make reports to Washington so as to radio?

If MAGEE is right in that assertion, why not cut down this \$682,000 to \$42,000 and just radio out of Washington for all cities. I think it is absolutely unfair, from the standpoint of five market centers, or else the service is not what we try to make the farmer believe it is. That is the only conclusion I can come to on the whole proposition. And here is one other thing: My friend, Mr. BUCHANAN, made a strong argument in reference to the standardization of farm products, and I agree that the standards of the five eastern centers are all different on hogs, sheep, calves, steers, or beef. They all grade differently. One stock market might grade light, heavy, and medium, and another grade some other way. If the Department of Agriculture is given \$60,000, they will compel the standardization of grades; and when the news is radioed or broadcast to-morrow that in Buffalo hogs grading A were sold at 6½ cents and there were 100,000 head on the market, but at Pittsburgh there was a shortage of hogs and the price was 6¢, why, then the farmer knows whether he ought to ship his hogs to Buffalo or Pittsburgh.

Mr. MADDEN. When did the Department of Agriculture get authority to grade?

Mr. BEGG. The Department of Agriculture does not need it.

Mr. MADDEN. They do.

Mr. BEGG. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. MADDEN. They can not do it now without authority.

Mr. BEGG. They will get authority if you give them the money.

Mr. MADDEN. They can not if we give them the money.

Mr. BEGG. Well, answering the gentleman, they do issue standard reports where you have appropriated \$682,000.

Mr. MADDEN. But they can not grade.

Mr. BEGG. Such an argument as that, there is nothing to it.

Mr. MADDEN. But the gentleman says they have power to grade.

Mr. BEGG. I said their reports—

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman knows they have not got power to grade.

Mr. BEGG. There is not any argument in that at all.

Mr. MADDEN. You do not need an argument when you are stating a fact.

Mr. BEGG. The report put out by the Department of Agriculture makes a report of a standard grade, and it is not any different in any of the markets or any of the cities where the gentleman from Chicago has already appropriated \$682,000, and they have it in his city now. Ask him if he wants to surrender it and he will tell you no.

Mr. TINCER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. Yes.

Mr. TINCER. What is a grade A hog?

Mr. MADDEN. The laws of the United States authorize the Department of Agriculture to do the things it is doing.

Mr. BEGG. Here are the trunk lines that go through. They do not hit the big markets. It goes through Columbus, Ohio, and does not go through Buffalo. It misses Buffalo and Pittsburgh and Cleveland and Cincinnati. It misses Indianapolis. Those are the five biggest livestock markets east of the Mississippi River except Chicago. And what will be the cost? Simply a branch line, and then a man to put in those markets to collect the data and put it out in the daily report. And I leave it to the gentlemen of the committee whether or not that service is worth while to the farmer. If it is worth while—

Mr. WEFALD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BEGG. I yield.

Mr. WEFALD. Will the gentleman please tell us whether the farmers who have been shipping their hogs or cattle to these five yards have been receiving for them more than those shipping to Chicago and Kansas City?

Mr. BEGG. I can not give that.

Mr. WEFALD. The idea in asking for the appropriation is that it will benefit the farmer?

Mr. BEGG. Yes. I will answer the gentleman's question. Supposing the market in Buffalo is overloaded to-day and at Pittsburgh there is a shortage, and you live in Iowa or Indiana or Ohio and to-morrow you want to ship a couple of carloads of hogs, as a cooperative, to Buffalo where the market is crowded. Is there an equal chance to get as good price there as there would be in Pittsburgh, where the market is not overcrowded? Would it not be of advantage to you to know that the Buffalo market is crowded and the Pittsburgh market is not overcrowded?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. I yield.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. I can not quite understand the necessity of reporting from Cleveland, Cincinnati, and Indianapolis; they are points so close together.

Mr. BEGG. The answer is my proposition to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WEFALD]. Unless there is somebody to collect the data, how do the people in Iowa know whether the market at Cincinnati or Cleveland or Indianapolis is crowded?

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. Yes.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. I would like to give the gentleman a little information.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. I ask that the gentleman from Ohio may have five minutes longer.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas and the gentleman from Ohio ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] may proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEGG. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. I will ask the gentleman if he is familiar with all these markets, including Chicago and Kansas City? If so, he knows that every evening it is known how many hogs and how many cattle were in all these markets on that particular day. The gentleman knew that?

Mr. BEGG. Yes.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. That is absolutely right. I will say further to the gentleman that the information that there is a big run at Buffalo would not be worth anything to the Iowa shipper.

Mr. BEGG. Why not?

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Simply because before he got his hogs there, there would not be a big run. These things are just as sensitive as the magnetic needle.

Mr. BEGG. Why, then, would it not be fair to say that if you got a report that there is a crowding at Buffalo the place to ship them then would be to the crowded market? Because by the time you got them there the market would be scarce.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. The gentleman has no real concrete conception of the way this business is done.

The gentleman knows further that the Iowa farmer as a rule, with rare exceptions, never ships hogs to Buffalo or Cincinnati, and the Iowa farmer ships millions of hogs to Chicago.

Mr. BEGG. They get the benefit of the service there.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. The shippers in Indianapolis and Buffalo and Cincinnati wire Chicago and Kansas City and get what they need. There is a shortage in those cities, and they are not billed direct. The gentleman knows all that.

Mr. BEGG. Yes. We want the service.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. As I understand it, we have become somewhat confused as to the purpose of the amendment. If I understand the purpose of the amendment, it is to—

Mr. BEGG. To expand the service. I am afraid the gentleman is going to use all my time. I would like to yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WHITE]. I would like to answer him.

Mr. MORGAN. Now, concerning the necessity of the different markets mentioned, is it not for the purpose that they may know the sales made of the cooperative market shipments in order that they may regulate their shipments to the various markets?

Mr. BEGG. That is true.

Mr. MORGAN. Is it not further a fact that the stock shippers ship their stock from Buffalo to Pittsburgh, or from market to market, according to the conditions that prevail?

Mr. BEGG. Yes. Everybody knows that whoever did any business in the livestock market, that the market congests and opens up, and the man gets the long price who gets into the open market. Everyone knows that.

I believe the service provided to the producers of livestock through the use of the \$642,000 is good, and I believe the money is well spent; I also believe it is justifiable to add \$60,000 more to it in order that the five great livestock centers east of the Mississippi, save Chicago, will be provided with the same service, so that the farmers will know which market is the best market to which to ship and in which to sell.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers a substitute, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAGEE of New York as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. BEGG: On page 56, line 2, strike out the figures "\$682,480," and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$708,580."

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, this is an important service, as described by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG], and I have no feeling in the matter at all except that of doing my duty. It is no concern to me how the members of the committee may vote, but while I have the responsibilities of this bill I deem it is my duty to give to the members of the committee the facts in the premises.

The first appropriation made for this purpose was in 1917 and amounted to \$136,600; in 1918, \$184,740; in 1919, \$196,660; in 1920, \$250,000; in 1921, \$300,000; in 1922, \$390,160; in 1923, \$405,000; and in 1924, \$700,000.

I have no favorites to play and I would like to accommodate my friend from Ohio [Mr. BEGG], but I feel that it is my duty to present the facts. I have no policy except the public policy and no interest except the public interest.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I would like the privilege of making a statement, if it pleases the gentleman, so that I may give the committee the facts. You will note that the difference between the appropriation for 1923 of \$405,000 and the appropriation for this fiscal year of \$700,000 is nearly \$300,000. This appropriation was made in order that the Department of Agriculture might establish trunk lines. I want you to bear that in mind—trunk lines—because it seems to me there is a policy involved here that is a most important one.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] seems to complain because one of these trunk lines went to Atlanta. Well, I do not know why the city of Atlanta is not entitled to the service. Another trunk line, under this increased appropriation, was extended through to the coast, to San Francisco. I want you to bear in mind that there are different trunk lines. There is a trunk line for fruit and vegetables and also a trunk line for livestock-market news. These trunk lines are operated because we lease wires from the telegraph companies. Out of the appropriation of \$700,000 for the current year we are paying \$275,000 for leased wires.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] wants the service extended to Indianapolis, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Pittsburgh, and Buffalo. He assumes to speak for a city in my State. I have

had no communication from anybody in my State in reference to the necessity of establishing the service which the gentleman talks about in the city of Buffalo.

The fruit and vegetable trunk line of the West goes through Pittsburgh and Cincinnati, and the trunk line for the livestock service goes through the city of Columbus, Ohio. It is all in the discretion of the Department of Agriculture as to where these lines shall go and to what cities the service shall be extended. If the department desires it could just as well send this livestock wire through Pittsburgh and Cincinnati.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask for 10 additional minutes, or as much as may be necessary to give the facts.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. As I understand, the gentleman from Ohio says Columbus is not a livestock center. We are not to blame for that. Let the department send this trunk line through a livestock center; if Pittsburgh is one send it through Pittsburgh.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I would like to make my statement of the facts. The gentleman from Ohio has consumed his own time and I would like to consume mine. When I get through with my statement I will be glad to yield, but I want to get the facts before the members of the committee in order that they may vote intelligently in the premises. What I mean is this: The whole foundation of the structure is leased trunk lines, and if you are going to put lines all over this country, instead of having an appropriation of \$700,000, as you have now, in a few years you will have an appropriation of \$7,000,000.

I think that it was a wise policy on the part of the department to establish these trunk lines to the South and West, but laterally from its trunk lines they have come to depend on the radio and nobody can tell what the development of radio may be. My friend from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] says this radio business does not amount to anything. I do not know whether it does or not, because I do not know of anybody who knows less about radio than I do. But we have to depend upon the experts in the department as to how this service shall be operated.

Let me read from the hearings, page 708, with reference to the use of radio:

Supplementing the leased wire, as pointed out here, we have introduced the use of radio. We found it dependable between here and Rochester.

That is a city 81 miles west of my home city of Syracuse. I get paid for mileage for 435 miles. That is probably not in a direct line, but the city of Rochester must be, I should estimate, at least 400 miles from the city of Washington.

So dependable that the daily reports transmitted by our operator in Washington are taken by our receiving operator at Rochester from the wire with the same average accuracy as is received over the leased wire.

They radio this service from the city of San Francisco south to Los Angeles 370 miles, and from the city of San Francisco north to Portland, Oreg., 555 miles.

Let us now take the five cities which are mentioned by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McKEOWN. Will the gentleman yield for a question as to the southwest service?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. The southern service goes to Atlanta and Jacksonville, then there is a line to Fort Worth and Austin, Tex.

Mr. McKEOWN. Do they serve that country out there?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. That is what we made the additional appropriation a year ago of about \$300,000 for.

Mr. McKEOWN. That is what I thought.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. The service to Atlanta is on fruits and vegetables, primarily. In my opinion, the Congress should establish, through the department, trunk lines and from these trunk lines this service should be radioed. The gentleman claims you can not radio this news except from a city into which hogs and cattle and sheep are shipped. We do not have those shipments to Washington, and yet this service is radioed from Washington to the city of Rochester, and they say that it is entirely satisfactory.

Take Columbus, Ohio, where this livestock wire line goes through—why not establish a radio station there? Cleveland is only 130 miles away—I am giving approximate distances—Indianapolis, 175 miles; Cincinnati, 146 miles; Pittsburgh, 165 miles; and Buffalo, 269 miles.

Mr. MURPHY. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Let me make a statement, if the gentleman please.

Mr. MURPHY. Right here is where I want to ask the question.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I respectfully decline to yield just at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York declines to yield.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. If Columbus is not a livestock center and they want a livestock center from which to radio this news, the Department of Agriculture can change its trunk line from Columbus and have it go through Pittsburgh and Cincinnati, striking two of the cities to which the gentleman would give this service.

What my amendment does is to restore the existing appropriation. As I told you before, while most of these hearings were being held, as a member of the subcommittee on the Post Office Department bill, I was not present, and therefore I do not know why this amount was cut, but it was cut \$26,100, and the substitute which I have offered restores the appropriation of the existing year. I do not want to injure this service. It is a very important service. I told the gentleman from Ohio that I would take the matter up with him and the Department of Agriculture and try to solve the problem satisfactorily to everybody, but they can not wait a minute. They have got to get this money from the Treasury now, and that I am opposed to. The gentleman from Ohio need not charge me with being identified with any particular body, because I am not. The only interest I serve is the public interest. My sympathies are with the agricultural interests of this country. If anybody can point out to me any way that I can help them through any means which can be regarded as sound economically, I will be for that. That is my position in the matter.

I have offered this substitute to restore the amount of the existing appropriation because I do not want to take the responsibility of possibly restricting their present operations.

What the gentleman has said is that they want one man in Indianapolis and one man in the other cities to take care of this work. I have not any criticism to make of anybody, because I do not have complete information. I am here, like the rest of the Members, seeking information. Since the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations designated me to take charge of this bill, on account of the illness of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON], I have devoted myself assiduously to a study of the hearings and of the problems, and I am trying to digest them just as fast as I can.

Mr. MADDEN. And I want to say to the gentleman and to the House that there is no man who could do a better job. [Applause.]

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I thank the gentleman for his kind words. I do not mention what I am going to say in any spirit of criticism, because I do not know the facts, but if I have the responsibility of this bill at the next session I will go into this matter in the greatest detail and give to the Members of the House all the facts in the premises and my conclusions after a most thorough investigation.

Turning to page 713 of the hearings, this is what Mr. Marquis, of the department, says:

There are not more than three or four men at a station. There is a man in charge of the reporting, and if there are two or three classes of livestock—

Now listen to this—

to be reported, like we have in a big market, there may be a specialist to report on hogs, another one on cattle, and another one on sheep.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the gentleman yield for a question at that point?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I decline to yield until I have made a statement of the facts to the members of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes additional, or as much thereof as I may need.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. If they are going to have a specialist for hogs and one for cattle and one for sheep, and then an operator in addition, they have got to have four men, have they not, in each of these cities instead of one? If you carry that out, perhaps, to a logical conclusion, as is suggested to my mind, we might have an expert for turnips and one for

onions and one for cherries and one for every other vegetable that grows.

Mr. JEFFERS. And one for bananas.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Yes; and one for bananas.

In other words, you have here a question of policy which you must determine now, and the only way to do it, in my judgment, is to continue along the lines already laid down by the Congress, that all we can do is to establish these trunk lines, and then from the trunk lines, laterally, this valuable information must be radioed.

I thank you, gentlemen, for your attention.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Certainly.

Mr. MORGAN. Has the gentleman visited the livestock markets and observed the methods of reports?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I am not a livestock expert.

Mr. MORGAN. Is it not a fact that Chicago—

Mr. MAGEE of New York. If the gentleman wants to ask me about livestock practices let him get a little time and state them himself.

Mr. WEFALD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Yes.

Mr. WEFALD. I have listened to gentlemen here, and I would like to ask whether or not we can not get the weather observers to attend to this. I have noticed according to reports that the prices fluctuate up and down like the weather. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I do not question but that this appropriation is of some value to the farmers. But I question whether or not it is of the great value that some attach to it. I agree with the gentleman from Kansas that frequently when this information gets to the farmer he is two or three or five days, possibly, from the market where the scarcity of the supply occurs, and by the time he could get his product to that market the conditions might be entirely changed.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. I dislike to interrupt the gentleman, but I want to say in this connection that the supplies and estimates of supplies and conditions of the market—the fluctuations—are noted every morning on the bulletin board in all the great markets and it is accessible to every man and every cooperative society at once.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I agree with the gentleman. As the gentleman from New York says, in the last few years they have increased this appropriation from \$138,000 to \$700,000, and we are now asked to appropriate \$60,000 or \$70,000 more.

But I rose particularly to say something with reference to the argument of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG]. The gentleman from Ohio in the course of his argument, not perhaps with the intention of criticizing, referred to the fact that Atlanta had a leased wire. I hold in my hand a map prepared by the Agricultural Department showing the location of these leased-wire stations. I find that there are 33, as shown on this map, and there are only 11 of them in the South and the West. In other words, there are 22 north of the Ohio River and east of the Mississippi, including 2 at St. Paul, Minn., and possibly at some other station west of Chicago. The gentleman from Ohio says his amendment is for the express purpose of adding six more leased-wire stations to this congested center to which I have referred, and which now has two-thirds of all the leased-wire stations established under this appropriation and paid for by all the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. BEGG. The gentleman misunderstood my argument entirely if he thinks I was attempting to criticize. I was only comparing. I said if it was good for Atlanta, with one-sixth or one-eighth of the livestock handled in these other great cities, I thought it was good for those from the purchasers' standpoint.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the policy that the gentleman from Ohio speaks for should prevail, it will cost several million dollars to maintain this service.

Mr. BEGG. Oh, that is absurd.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman wants to establish two more in his own State and one at Indianapolis and one at Pittsburgh, and if you undertake to establish them all over the country I say it will cost many million dollars.

Mr. McKEOWN. I want to say that there are none in Oklahoma.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; and none likely to be. I take the position that we are now at that period of time when wireless is being rapidly developed and extended and we ought not to add to this already large appropriation which has been increased four or five times within the last five or six years, for in the course of another year or two it may be that all this information will be secured by radio and the Government saved the tremendous expense that will be involved if we establish leased-wire stations in all sections of the country.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, it sounds indeed strange to find so many who are friends of the farmer forgetting the great farming interests of Indiana, Illinois, Ohio, New York, and Pennsylvania. It seems very strange indeed that all the arguments that have been advanced have been on the line of trunk lines. They have failed at this time to say to you that the Government sends reports in these five great market governmental agencies for the gathering of State statistics and sending them out with the Government approval, and that is all we want. We want to send reports from Pittsburgh, we want to send them from Buffalo, we want to send them from Indianapolis, and all the other places where these wonderful markets are for the farmers of Indiana, the farmers of Ohio, the farmers of Pennsylvania, and New York, and we are only asking \$60,000, while you are spending \$700,000 and more to give the information to the farmers who live in other States. I am wondering if you appreciate that service and whether you marvel at us even daring to want it in Ohio, in Pennsylvania, in New York, and in Indiana. That is what we want this money for. It is to establish reliable gatherers of statistics, to establish reliable figures from which the farmers of these States where these cities are located may benefit through the Government stamp of authenticity. That is what we want, and I think that this committee will see the fairness of the proposition advanced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG].

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Chairman, I certainly do not want to be in the attitude of voting against an appropriation that would be of any benefit to any farmer, but this has been a comedy to me. There is just as much sense in the amendment as there is in Jim Beeg trying to instruct Hays White with reference to agriculture. Of course we all know that Congressman Beeg is a very learned man. I learned the other day that he was the great constitutional lawyer, and I was surprised beyond measure to-day when I heard him tell perhaps the oldest and one of the largest farmers that ever took part in the deliberations of this Congress something about agriculture.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And he was a great auctioneer a few weeks ago.

Mr. TINCHER. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. And this afternoon's News says that he is going to pay no attention to the Supreme Court decision and that on Monday he is going to pass the rent bill just the same.

Mr. TINCHER. Yes; and he may overrule the Supreme Court. [Laughter.] At any rate, he is a delightful fellow and we all love him. I did feel a little sorry for Mr. WHITE when he sat on him so roughly and told him about the enormous quantity of hogs and cattle and things that he had shipped out of Chicago, and I hope that some time he will give my friend WHITE the benefit of his valuable information on the subject of agriculture.

Mr. MURPHY. And he wants good figures to base it on, too.

Mr. TINCHER. I will say this for Mr. BEGG. Mr. BEGG knows just as much about agriculture as my delightful manufacturing friend from Ohio [Mr. MURPHY] does, which is not much. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, this is not a proposition for agriculture. It is a proposition to make a few places for a few employees. The farmers get this information now. There is not a little shipping station in the United States where in the morning, before you ship, you can not find out what the arrivals were at the various markets.

This is just a scheme to get some more money, and it will grow. It has grown to almost \$700,000 in a few years; and in 10 years the \$700,000 will be a joke, because every time you let it get out from the trunk lines to a few more places it adds to the amount of money enormously. Of course, it may be a means of sustaining the Western Union Telegraph Co. in spite of the radio if we will pay the taxpayers' money to them for sending out telegrams to be delivered some six or eight hours after the radio message has given us the facts. Of course, it is too bad that about one-third of that information goes to that portion of the country that produces the livestock, and only about two-thirds of it goes to the big cities.

Just wait. Inside of a week these big-town boys will have a chance to vote for something for agriculture, and they will forget all about this. These fellows who know about the grading of class A hogs, who have read a few agricultural reports and the reports of the Secretary, I would like to have them tell me where they grade the hogs?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, of course the gentleman from Kansas ought to tell the House that the Secretary of Agriculture has no power to grade hogs at all.

Mr. TINCER. Oh, I assume that Mr. BEGG is the only gentleman in the House who has produced hogs to such an extent that he knows what a grade class A hog is in Cleveland. [Laughter.]

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I was under the impression that when a farmer out in my country got ready to send a load of hogs to town he got the Chicago Drovers' Journal and all of the information every morning.

Mr. TINCER. Why, in the little home towns you go into a bank every morning before you leave, and the radio people will tell you what the supply was in all of the principal markets the day before. What we ought to be doing is reducing this appropriation and using the radio and not subsidizing the Western Union Telegraph Co. [Applause.]

Mr. MORGAN and Mr. MURPHY rose.

Mr. TINCER. Let me see, to which shall I yield? If I yield to Mr. MORGAN, I am afraid he will take up all of my time, so that I will yield to the shoe manufacturer from Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. TINCER. Then I shall gladly yield the floor. [Laughter.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Chairman, I do not know as much about hogs as the gentleman from Kansas, and I do not mean Mr. WHITE, either. I spent 26 years of the first part of my life on a farm, and yet I do not know as much about livestock as some of these gentlemen have stated here to-day that they know. I do know a few things, however. I know that since I have been here we have been voting for Muscle Shoals, we have been voting millions of dollars to nearly every western section of the country, and it will not be very long until the Eastern States and, in fact, all of the States that have harbors will want large appropriations. Some gentleman will rise and want an appropriation for them. I remind gentlemen that when you look at this bill, the State of Indiana, with its nearly 3,000,000 of population, you will find, is left out entirely—and we have not asked for any other appropriations. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE] undertakes to tell you that this matter will not amount to anything; that it is of no account at all. If that be true, why not strike out the \$682,000 entirely and wipe it all out? [Applause.] The very fact that it is in the bill is proof that it is of value. There sits my friend from Indianapolis [Mr. MOORE]; he comes from the heart of Indiana, the greatest State in the Union, and yet it is left out. We sell our livestock at Buffalo and Cleveland, and we are entitled to this service. [Applause.]

What is wrong with the farmers of the West? They have no market. Do you want to bottle them up and not let them have any market? They are bottled up as far as the markets of the world are concerned. Their products are a drug upon the market, and they can not get anything for them, and yet gentlemen do not want them to have access even to the eastern markets. I say it is an important matter. The people of the State of Indiana are not asking an appropriation, but they think that by increasing this \$60,000 Indianapolis and these other cities will be accommodated. They say there is nobody asking for it but the telegraph companies. I wonder if the gentleman from Kansas wants to help the radio companies—

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Oh, no.

Mr. COOK. I meant the other good-looking gentleman from Kansas. [Laughter.] What he does not know about livestock and things of that kind would not make a primer.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOK. I will.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Is it not a fact that this same service is furnished western farmers on small markets?

Mr. COOK. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. In the State of Ohio we market daily several hundred thousand dollars worth of livestock.

Mr. COOK. In these States we raise as much livestock as any other section.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman will yield further, last year we marketed 25,000 cattle, 50,000 calves, 125,000 sheep, and 634,000 hogs to markets made and reported by middlemen

themselves or their agencies. Does not the gentleman think we are entitled to the same unbiased, accurate, and complete Government-reported marketing service that is given the western farmer?

Mr. COOK. Yes; we want equal facilities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman [applause], I think I may say what I care to say in three minutes. I think probably the argument is closed now. Really, I have not thought at any time that the service under discussion was of great utility to the stock raisers and stock feeders of the country. I made the statement on the floor of the House something like two years ago that we had the market as quickly from Chicago in the Daily Drovers' Journal as we had it from the reports of the Agricultural Department here in Washington. That statement was questioned by Mr. ANDERSON, the then chairman of the subcommittee. Now, I want to state the facts. There is no sound and fury in this talk. Every man who is a stockman, who has had experience, who has been on the market, who has handled stock for years, knows that all the information that is sought to be secured through this amendment is available to every stockman in the United States every day. He knows that on the bulletin board in the Kansas City lobby is set down the receipts at every great market in the United States every morning.

Mr. MURPHY. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. I will be glad to do so.

Mr. MURPHY. Does not the gentleman know that the large cities that are asking this service do not have governmental reports and no one to gather the governmental statistics to send out?

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Well, then, I will modify my statement and say every livestock market of any importance in the United States [laughter] has on the bulletin board every morning a statement as to the condition of the market, the fluctuations in swine, sheep, and cattle.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. In a moment. Now, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG], who has handled so many cattle from Chicago, I do not know how many millions [laughter], tells us about the different grades of stock, how they are graded at different markets; that one class of cattle of a certain weight are graded at one market differently from the manner in which they are graded at another market. Surprising information. However, I think everyone knows who has had any experience with livestock that there is much more in the quality than in the weight. Let me ask some of the short-grass men from Texas—

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska rose.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Everything is in the quality and in the breeding. Now I will claim the five minutes for which I have been recognized, although I may not need it. I do not understand, gentlemen, there is any discrimination against the cooperative organizations. I do not understand that the farm bureau to which the gentleman referred in his speech as having filed so many memorials on this subject is a corporation for the transaction of business at any place in the United States. It is an association, as I understand it, for advancing the interests of agriculture through conferences and dissemination of information, as all lines of industry and business have associations.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. I will be glad to yield to my good friend.

Mr. BEGG. The farm bureau and cooperative associations, according to their information to me, are working hand in hand in putting this stock on the market—one-half a second and I am through—and they claim that these reports that they get from the stock markets in these centers are biased against the cooperatives.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Well, if there is any corporation engaged in business that is guilty of unfair practices, his amendment will not cure it. It will not help it in the least. Now, I say the quotations from the Daily Drovers' Telegram and Drovers' Journal, of Chicago, are not accredited to any commission house or any cooperative society. The sales are collected from different firms and printed for the benefit of the country at large. But I have never believed this Government service was in any sense superior to the service furnished by the publications especially devoted to that work.

I do not believe to-day that it is an organization of any particular utility to agriculture in this country. I know of no unjust discrimination against the cooperative organizations; and I will say further and unqualifiedly that I want to see the cooperative salesman, both as a commission salesman and as a

country dealer handling the products of the farmer, to have a fair chance and a square deal with a regular corporation, and I believe they have it, and they ought to have it, without any discrimination. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired. The question is on agreeing to the substitute of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE] to the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 35, noes 56.

So the substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BEGG. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is called for.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 35, noes 56.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment to strike out the paragraph. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BEGG: Strike out the paragraph beginning on line 16, page 55, and ending on line 2, page 56.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BEGG. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is asked for.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that no man can demand a division unless he rises.

Mr. BEGG. I am up. What is the matter with the gentleman from Texas? [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Ohio to strike out the paragraph.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 27, noes 64.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMPLETION OF WOOLWORK

To enable the Bureau of Agricultural Economics to complete the work of the Domestic Wool Section of the War Industries Board and to enforce Government regulations for handling the wool clip of 1918 as established by the wool division of said board, pursuant to the Executive order dated December 31, 1918, transferring such work to the said bureau, \$11,290, and to continue, as far as practicable, the distribution among the growers of the wool clip of 1918 of all sums heretofore or hereafter collected or recovered with or without suit by the Government from all persons, firms, or corporations which handled any part of the wool clip of 1918.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the paragraph on the ground that it abounds in legislation and is not authorized by existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, this paragraph appropriates \$11,290 "to enable the bureau to complete the work of the Domestic Wool Section of the War Industries Board, and to enforce Government regulations for handling the wool clip for 1918 as established by the wool division of said board, pursuant to the Executive order dated December 31, 1918, transferring such work to the said bureau." There is no authority of law, I insist, for this paragraph, and certainly not for the provision providing for the enforcement of regulations made by the War Industries Board.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. McKEOWN. The purpose of this provision is to assist, is it not, in the recovery of funds due to the woolgrowers from the allocation of the wool?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think so.

Mr. McKEOWN. It is not meritorious.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I insist that this money should not come out of the Treasury. We have appropriated \$105,500 since 1920 to enforce the regulations made by the War Industries Board in 1918. In other words, it is a hang-over war proposition.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. I think if the gentleman will ask my colleague from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH], who represents a wool district, he will tell you, and I can affirm myself, since I represent partly a wool district, that this is just to pay a bunch of employees who have never been worth a cent to the woolgrowers of the Southwest, and we have been carrying it here for five years.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Absolutely, for the purpose of maintaining certain places and paying certain employees six years after the war has come to a close. There ought to be an end to these war boards.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Does the gentleman know of any wool-grower who ever received a dollar from this distribution?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There may have been some. But I will say to the gentleman this: They have collected over \$730,000, so the hearings show. They distributed about \$350,000, or about half the amount that they have collected, and the average amount paid to a woolgrower is \$3. They paid in some cases checks for \$100 and checks for \$10, and other amounts have been paid, but it is admitted that in a great many cases it is only a few cents that is paid to the wool-grower. The expense involved does not justify such an expenditure. Even if \$3 is the average amount refunded, I submit that it does not justify spending \$105,500 of the people's money. There ought to be an end to this proposition.

Mr. HUDSPETH. If the average is \$3, that would be equivalent to 3 pounds of wool.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to address myself to the question of whether this was authorized by law or not.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CHINDEN). Let the Chair ascertain whether it is contended that there is authority of law for this appropriation. The Chair will ask the chairman of the subcommittee whether it is contended that there is authority of law for this appropriation?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I do not know whether there is authority for it or not, but it has been carried in the agricultural appropriation bill for a number of years. I would ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] to reserve his point of order for the present. There are suits pending to collect the balance of the money and some \$753,000 is in the hands of the Department of Justice for collection. What are you going to do? Drop the cases?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman from New York that this will not interfere with those cases. If those suits are founded in law certainly the failure to make an appropriation of \$11,290 to pay somebody a salary in the Agricultural Department will not serve to defeat those lawsuits.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee that I do not understand that one cent of this \$11,000 goes to pay anybody's salary. As I understand from the hearings, these are moneys for the purpose of meeting the expenses occasioned by the litigation that is pending. It seems to me that it would be very foolish to stop the collection of these moneys. So far as the Treasury is concerned, money is going into the Treasury all the time and there now remains in the Treasury \$138,935 which can not be distributed. If the gentleman's discernment is so keen that he has found one source of revenue to the Treasury, a little money going into the Treasury, and the gentleman wants to stop it, all right, but here is one place where something is going into the Treasury.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman permit me to make a remark right there?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman is not going to contend that this money is in the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. That is what I understand.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The hearings show exactly to the contrary.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Let me read the gentleman the facts.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. But I have the facts right here as shown by the hearings. The gentleman himself developed the fact that this is a special fund of the Agricultural Department and has never been paid into what we call the "miscellaneous fund" of the Treasury and placed to the credit of the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. The amount that I stated is credited to the woolgrowers who can not be found, and all of the amount so credited is in the Treasury to-day, and eventually will be placed to the credit of this Government.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I will read to my colleague what appears in the hearings:

There remains in the Treasury, which we know to be undistributable, \$138,935.83, which you will see is a great deal more than the attempt to collect and distribute has cost the Government up to this time, or will cost the Government.

They claim they can not find or locate the people to whom that money is due—\$138,935.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Then why pay it all out in salaries? Mr. Chairman, the statement is made, and the facts I have before me show, that this money has never been paid into the Treasury of the United States. It is spoken of here as being in the Treasury of the United States. The authorities in the Agricultural Department have placed the fund that has been collected in a special fund to the special credit of this particular activity. It has never been paid into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury and is not there now.

I insist that if you are going to continue to collect this money, and if you are going to continue to pay salaries to employees for this hang-over war proposition—which should have been settled several years ago—then pay the salaries out of that special fund, and do not take it out of the Treasury of the United States. You have already appropriated \$105,500 out of the Treasury in order to carry on this work, and yet you say you have \$138,000 which has not been distributed because you have not been able to find the wool growers. My information from these hearings is that you have only distributed \$350,000, and yet you have collected \$738,000. I say that if you are going to carry on this work, then let the work pay for itself and do not take it out of the Treasury of the United States. If we are going to listen to those who are drawing these salaries, we will probably be here for the next 10 years paying these salaries while these lawsuits in the United States Supreme Court and other places are being settled. This appropriation has been made every year for over four years for the completion of the wool-section work, and yet we are as far from having it completed now as we ever were.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order, the Chair will say to the gentleman from Texas, is the determination of this point of order.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I was discussing the merits of the proposition, having been led astray. If the Chair wishes to hear anything on the point of order, I think I can show that Mr. Sherman himself admits that this is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would suggest, if he may, that one important question will be the original act under which the War Industries Board operated, and then if there is any authority of law the legal authority pursuant to which the Executive order was issued transferring this work to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I want to address myself to that particular point when the gentleman from Tennessee concludes.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman from Tennessee desires to discuss the point of order further, the Chair will be glad to hear him.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I want to read the Chair what Mr. Sherman, who appeared before the committee on behalf of this appropriation, had to say upon the subject of whether or not this was authorized by law, as follows:

The War Industries Board made a promise to the grower before they went out of office that they would make an effort to collect and return the excess profits. We fell heir to that promise, and Congress has aided us every year in making appropriations to help us carry out that promise, and the courts have held that while the War Industries Board may have exceeded its powers in promulgating this regulation, it did not exceed the powers which Congress could have granted it, and that Congress by appropriation of money year after year for this purpose completely ratified and cured any legal defect that might have existed in the beginning.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is a very curious doctrine.

Mr. SHERMAN. Some lawyers have told us that it was a very curious doctrine, but every judge has upheld it.

There is an admission from Mr. Sherman himself that the appropriation bills enacted from year to year have, in the judgment of the courts, ratified the regulation. But the Chair very well knows an appropriation bill holds good only from year to year, and here we are seeking to make a new appropriation which, if Mr. Sherman be correct, would have the effect of ratifying these regulations adopted eight years ago, and I am insisting, of course, that while he may be correct that they

were ratified and approved by Congress for the year for which the appropriation bill was passed, yet on July 1 the ratification which was given by the current appropriation bill will have expired, and therefore that can not be cited as an authority for this particular appropriation for the coming fiscal year.

The Chair will recall that in 1918 the Government undertook to take over the purchase of wool. It established certain regulations as an incident to the taking over or the control of wool. By these regulations it was provided that dealers in distributing centers should have a certain percentage over their gross profits, and that dealers who bought directly from the growers of wool should have 1½ cents per pound over their gross profits. I know of no law which would permit the Government to undertake to fix prices in this country except by the process of commandeering. The Government had the right during the war to commandeer the wool and then pay the party from whom it was commandeered such price as the Government thought was reasonable; and if that party was dissatisfied, then he had the right to appeal to the courts and secure a proper adjustment of the price; but here we are six years after the war has come to a close. They have collected, it is true, \$738,000 from dealers who, they say, exceeded the price attempted to be fixed by the Government—and I may say here that I know of some cases of very small dealers who have been called upon to make payments when they had no profits, because it had been held by the Government or those in charge of this work that, where a dealer buys from another dealer, and that dealer bought from a grower, and that dealer made his one and a half cents profit, then the second dealer from whom they are now demanding these profits shall not be entitled to any profit whatsoever. In other words, his rent, all of his overhead, all of the expenses of his clerks and help in the handling of the wool and the freight and everything of that sort shall be at a loss to him.

I insist that there is no law which would justify these regulations, and yet this provision undertakes to ratify them for the next year by saying, "To enable the wool section to enforce the regulation promulgated by the War Industries Board in 1918." Neither is there law or regulation for the distribution proposed. This is a matter which requires legislation, and that legislation should be proposed by the regular legislative committee and not by way of a rider on an appropriation bill. I submit that the point of order is well taken.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to say anything about the merits of this matter. The probabilities are that there is a great deal of force in the suggestions made by the gentleman from Tennessee, but that is not the question now involved. The question is whether it comes within the rules and is in order, and anything else is extraneous. This comes under paragraph 2 of Rule XXI:

No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law.

The question, therefore, is whether this expenditure had been previously authorized by law. I think there is no doubt about that matter, Mr. Chairman. The paragraph says:

To enable the Bureau of Agricultural Economics to complete the work of the domestic wool section.

The appropriation is made to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Will anyone contend that that bureau is not authorized by law to expend any sums of money that might properly be given to it?

So, the authorization going to a bureau of the Government, this authorization by law certainly is good in that respect. Now, what are they authorized to do? They are authorized to complete the work of the domestic wool section of the War Industries Board and to enforce Government regulations for handling the wool clip of 1918 as established by the wool division of said board, pursuant to the Executive order dated December 31, 1918, transferring such work to the said bureau.

Now, the question is whether the authority to transfer that work from the War Industry Board to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics was with legal authority or whether it was not. There can be no question on that, because under the national defense act of 1916 certain extraordinary powers were given to the President of the United States in time of war.

If the Chair will look at that act, he will find in the provisions for the organization of the national defense act—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will yield, I make no question on the right of the Executive to transfer the work of the War Industries Board to the Agricultural Department. My point is that the War Industries Board had no right to make the regulation for which this bill undertakes to make

the appropriation. It is a question of transfer, and I think the transfer was legal.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. All right, bring the thing down to that issue. Admit that the transfer was legal and made in pursuance of the law. The only remaining thing for the Chair is the question of whether there was any authority in the War Industries Board to do what the gentleman says they have done and to continue it. I think there is no question as to that proposition. I will read from section 10151 of Barnes's Code, page 2428:

The President is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to appoint a board on mobilization of industries essential for military preparedness, nonpartisan in character, and to take all necessary steps to provide for such clerical assistance as he may deem necessary to organize and coordinate the work hereinbefore described.

The President in time of war or when war is imminent is empowered, through the head of any department of the Government, in addition to the present authorized methods of purchase or procurement, to place an order with any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry for such product or material as may be required, and which is of the nature and kind usually produced or capable of being produced by such individual, firm, company, association, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry.

And so on; it is not necessary to read the whole section, but in this is a specific authorization to the President to at any time take possession of any industry, any business, any manufacturing establishment, at any place in the country. There is ample authority given in the first section of the act and in the succeeding sections of the act so the President might, if he desired, take the product of any particular industry or business and use it for war purposes.

In pursuance of that authority plainly contained in the provisions of that statute, the President made an order taking over the whole wool products of the country for war purposes. We can not question the authority at this time. Everyone admits that he did so. The best evidence that the President had the power is that the President did exercise it. If anyone says that he did not have that authority, it seems to me that he ought to be compelled to establish it. Where an order such as this has been made by one in Executive authority, then the presumption must be that the order was legally made.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will yield, I want to say that the gentleman has entirely missed my point. I said expressly that I did not question the right of the President to commandeer the wool for Government purposes during the war. That was done and nobody questions it. It is not a question of the action of the President. This is a proposition now to enforce regulations that were made in 1918, made without legal authority, and which have no application to the commandeering of wool by the Government.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Will the gentleman permit me to answer that?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the regular order. Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And in addition to that it provides for continuing as far as practicable the distribution among the growers of the wool crop of 1918 of all sums heretofore or hereafter collected or recovered with or without suit by the Government from all persons, firms, or corporations. I say to the gentleman that neither he nor anyone else can find a regulation providing for this and adopted by the War Industries Board, save the direction of the chairman, that if it was possible the money should be redistributed.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I shall make one point of order that is good, and that is that there is no quorum present.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Just a word and I shall conclude.

Mr. BLANTON. We were here until 11.15 o'clock last night and we ought to quit.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. I think the gentleman is right about that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present, which seems to be seconded by the gentleman from Nebraska. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Fifty-nine Members present, not a quorum.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. CHINDBLOM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under

consideration the bill H. R. 7220 and had come to no resolution thereon.

The SPEAKER resumed the chair.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 8839) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the agricultural bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECK. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to appropriating public money for the Department of Agriculture I do not believe we can afford to be stingy, especially if that department is using the money to enhance the greatest of all industries—agriculture. That was the purpose for which the department was created. When agriculture is prosperous, so is every other legitimate industry prosperous. When it is not, we are met with industrial failures everywhere.

But should the Agricultural Department not function as its founders intended, should it divert public money appropriated by Congress to uses other than those directed by the Congress, I believe we can well afford to ask what are the people getting in return for the money expended? The people are willing to pay a dollar in taxes if they can get \$2 in return, but they are not willing to pay a dollar and get only 50 cents in return.

On August 15, 1921, an act passed by the Sixty-seventh Congress, known as the packers and stockyards act, went into effect. I shall not go into any lengthy discussion of what led to the passage of that act. I will only quote briefly from the report of the Federal Trade Commission of July, 1918, after this commission had made an exhaustive investigation of the meat-packing industry. Speaking of the five big meat packers, the report says (page 24):

If the five great concerns owned no packing plants and killed no cattle and still retained control of the instruments of transportation, of marketing, and of storage, their position would not be less strong than it is.

The producer of livestock is at the mercy of these five companies, because they control the market and the marketing facilities and, to some extent, the rolling stock which transports the products to the market.

The competitors of these five concerns are at their mercy, because of the control of the market places, storage facilities, and refrigerator cars for distribution.

The consumer of meat products is at the mercy of these five, because both producer and competitor are helpless to bring relief.

To remedy these conditions the commission recommended that the Government take over all stock and refrigerator cars, stockyards, branch houses, and cold-storage plants for the chief purpose of encouraging competition in the packing industry. Competition seems to be the one thing needed to relieve the monopolistic hold the packers seemed to have over the food supply of the country. That idea is not put forward by the Federal Trade Commission alone, but it is the central idea running all through the hearings on the packers and stockyards bill.

It is true farmers complained of a great many fraudulent practices at the livestock terminals, such as short changing, underweighing, dockage, crippling stock in order to supply rendering plants, and so forth, but with the establishment of competition in buying and selling at the livestock terminals it was thought by Congress that most of these practices would disappear.

What has been the result? The very practices Congress tried to abolish appear to have continued unabated until Minnesota, a year and a half after the packers and stockyards act went into effect, asked for the repeal of this act in order that that State could offer some protection to the livestock producers of the Northwest at the South St. Paul terminal. This was an appeal made to Congress by the Minnesota Legislature in January, 1923.

This was followed April 4, 1923, by a statement coming from the Department of Agriculture to the effect that in checking

up the books of the commission men at one of the large livestock terminals of the Middle West it was found that six commission firms had been making improper account sales, and "when these shortcomings were called to the attention of the livestock exchange at that market these firms were fined a total of \$1,600," and one of them retired from the market. This criticism is made against the old-line commission men, the men who had been guilty of short changing the farmers, cheating on weights, overdockage, crippling livestock for the rendering plants, and so forth.

The audit, however, included legal agents of farmer customers. Contrast the polite criticism of the old-line commission firms above with that of the farmers' shipping associations farther on in this same release of April 4. It says:

On one of the large markets, where a large percentage of livestock is consigned by cooperative shipping associations, it was found that commission men had been making a bid for business by giving a "rake-off" to the managers of local shipping associations. Investigation by the representatives of the packers and stockyards administration showed that bogus sales slips were being made out which did not show the actual amounts paid for the livestock by packers or other buyers. The commission men themselves did not profit by these shady transactions, except that by giving attractive terms to managers of shipping associations they were able to increase their business. The Government men found that on this particular market many of these managers made it a practice to "shop" around among commission men to get the biggest "rake-off" possible. Needless to say, this practice very suddenly stopped.

In other words, for a commission firm to short-change a farmer as much as \$450 on a shipment of stock, or to underweigh a car of stock 3,000 pounds, or to cripple two or three hogs in order to send them to a rendering plant where the packers were making over 700 per cent on invested capital, these were called "shortcomings." But for a farmer to load a shipment of cattle belonging to himself and neighbors and go into market where he tried to get the best terms possible for his shipment, he was accused of "shopping around" and trying to get a "rake-off." He was accused of "shady transactions." Absolute stealing on the part of the old-line commission men is a "shortcoming." Trying to create competition in buying, on the part of the farmer, is a "shady transaction." Think of a farmer being accused of "shady transactions" for doing the very thing the law gave him a right to do, while a commission firm that absolutely steals from the farmer is merely guilty of a "shortcoming."

But the release of April 4 did not seem to help much, because the farmers continued to complain about the way the act was working out. So in July, 1923, the Livestock Exchange came to the rescue of the Department of Agriculture and published the fact that instead of six firms at this terminal being guilty of "shortcomings" there were 16, and instead of the exchange fining them \$1,600 it fined them about \$6,000. But even that did not allay the criticism, so about a month later the Secretary of Agriculture went to Atlantic City or somewhere and delivered a speech. About two months later, however, he was forced to follow the law and hold hearings on a few cases of illegal practices.

Suppose Congress had passed this law and placed its administration in my hands, and suppose, further, that I was opposed to meddling with the practices of the packers and commission firms at all, and suppose I was determined they should continue their illegal practices with as little hindrance as possible. The first thing I would do would be to surround myself with administrative officials who were also opposed to the act and did not desire to have it enforced. To make sure that I got that kind of officials I would prescribe such qualifications to the Civil Service Commission as would bring men out of the employ of commission firms themselves. I would provide that they must know: "1. Theory and practice or accounts as applied to livestock commission merchants," and "2. Education and experience." If I felt there would be the least doubt about my getting men from among the commission firms, I would explain that "under the second subject applicants must show that they have had at least four years of practical experience on the books of account of livestock commission merchants. This experience must have involved the keeping of double-entry books of account and must have included the preparation of trial balances, profits and loss statements of balance sheets."

This is exactly the qualifications asked for by the Civil Service Commission, and the language I have used is taken verbatim from the civil service circular No. 340, advertising the examination.

I have been told that every accountant of the Packers and Stockyards Administration has been taken out of the commis-

sion firms, and all the supervisors at the livestock terminals, with few exceptions, have formerly been commission men or employees of the commission firms and packers. One of the supervisors was formerly the chief lobbyist in the State of Minnesota against any packer or stockyards legislation.

In order to verify these stories I went to Mr. Chester Morrill, head of the Packers and Stockyards Administration, and asked if I could see the St. Paul file. He said I could, but before he showed it to me he said he would have to give me a little of the background of the case so I would understand it. But when he discovered I already had considerable of a background of the case I was informed I could not see it unless I would keep it confidential. I told him I was a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture, and, whatever information I received, I would lay it before this committee. He then informed me he had no authority to permit me to see the file. I then asked him for a list of supervisors and other employees in the Packers and Stockyards Administration, together with their salaries and expenses, and he informed me he had no authority to give that to me. I then asked for copies of the weekly reports of work performed by the supervisors, and he said he had no authority to give me that. In other words, the people of the United States are spending \$410,500 a year, and next year they will spend over \$452,540 in administering the packers and stockyards act, and they have no right to know what they are getting for their money.

But I have discovered some things they are getting. I have a few weekly reports of the supervisors, general superintendents, and other titled nobility in the department showing some things they do for the money they receive. I am told they receive between \$4,000 and \$5,000 a year salary and expenses; but I could not verify this, because Mr. Morrill had no authority to give me the facts.

One supervisor reports for a week's work: A hearing was held on a complaint about watering facilities and weighing services, and the conditions complained of shows an improvement.

Another reports for his week's work: Water supply comes from artesian wells and city hydrants and is first class. The stockyards company has two tanks holding 60,000 gallons.

Another reports for his week's work: The sale of "soft hogs," guaranteed to kill "hard," but they did not, and the commission firm selling the hogs lost \$200.

The supervisor suggested that the interested parties work out a definite plan for handling cases of this sort. His suggestions met with approval of officials of both the packer and commission firm and a definite plan will be put forward at the proper time.

Another reports: 120,797 more hogs received than for the same month in 1922, and that only one minor complaint has been received this week, and it has been investigated and adjusted.

Another report says: Nothing of very great significance has transpired at this market this week.

Another reports that his time was well taken up with adjusting complaints and making investigations.

Another spent the week in endeavoring to influence the interested parties in lowering their deduction of \$2 per hundred on crippled hogs.

Another weekly report says:

The price of horses is higher this week, good horses bringing \$130 to \$135, and better horses bring a better price.

Another supervisor reports:

I have been more active this week than last, as I have visited Buffalo, Cleveland, and Detroit.

At Buffalo he found the salesmen trying to force the buyers to assume all the risk of reactors. At Cleveland he found the physical condition of the property "showed marked improvement." At Detroit he spent his time trying to locate six hogs the packer claimed to have lost.

Another supervisor reports that he notified the superintendent of the yards that he had received a complaint about the water pressure at the south end of the yard, and he proceeded to investigate. He found the water of good quality. He also said he was "considering some things that he would report on later."

Another weekly report says—

great improvement is noticed in the bedding of stock cars.

It continues—

It looks as if our efforts are bearing fruit.

Another reports for his week's work:

Triplicate sales tickets have been ordered.

He also reports that a—

commission firm, through mistake, weighed to a trader a fat heifer instead of a feeder cow, and the Traders' Exchange and the supervisor brought the parties together in the office of the stockyards administration, and after going over the case in detail it was agreed each should stand half the loss. Both parties appeared satisfied.

Another supervisor reports he—

attended a conference this week where railroad officials were adjusting rates and congested conditions on their lines, and one of these officials said "the number of officials present is due to the presence of a representative of the Department of Agriculture," and that "his presence contributed to the favorable outcome of the conference." The supervisor was asked to attend the next conference also.

Another reports:

I had occasion to listen in on a conversation between a packer and a commission man, and both expressed unqualified approval of the way the act is administered. One said, "We know now that we are all going to be treated alike."

Another reports:

Your supervisor was again complimented by the stockyards company on the fine train service he was instrumental in bringing about—

And that—

the railroad officials are keen to know of cases where trains are unduly late in reaching their destination.

Ye gods! There has not been a day or an hour in 25 years that a railroad company has not known exactly where its trains are and whether they were late.

Another spent a whole week in trying to find a heifer that had been lost in transit by some shipper. And so it goes.

I laid these facts before the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture. I had been told that these committees never functioned except when the House and the committees were of a different political complexion from the administration, and they only functioned then when it was desired to dig up something against the administration to be used in campaigns. But it occurred to me that Congress and the people have a right to know what is being done with the money we are appropriating, whether the House and the administration are of a different political complexion or not. The committee felt the same way, and its chairman and myself appeared before the Committee on Accounts and asked for a clerk to enable us to look into the expenditures of the Department of Agriculture. We laid before that committee the information I have here given. We made it plain we were not starting out on a muckraking campaign, but that we hoped to be able to render some assistance to the Secretary of Agriculture in his endeavor to be of service to the farmers of this country. That was three weeks ago and the committee has no clerk yet. The Democratic members of the Committee on Accounts were in favor of giving us a clerk. The chairman of the committee was noncommittal. The Republican member from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL] thought if there was anything which ought to be looked into it should be done by a special committee.

Another Republican Member was opposed to any investigation, saying:

We have too many investigations now.

But the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture has gone ahead with the inquiry as best it can without a clerk. We asked for the pay roll of the packers and stockyards act about three weeks ago, and the Secretary of Agriculture said he would get it for us. I am informed by a clerk in the department that it has been ready for us over two weeks, but the committee did not receive it until to-day, since which time I have not been able to examine it.

Up to date we have had three witnesses from the department testify. The most important is John M. Burns, of the solicitor's office in the Department of Agriculture. Mr. Burns is well known to congressional committees. His work is directly connected with the administration of the packers and stockyards act. He testified that those who are administering the act—have moved contrary to the letter and spirit of the antitrust laws; they have set up a public policy and a self-constituted authority that is entirely out of harmony and out of line with the spirit and purpose of the legislation they were acting under, and they have diverted public funds to the accomplishment of an illegal purpose.

He further testified—

that if the department had exerted its influence to bring about competitive action in the stockyards rather than to stifle it it would have been worth many millions of dollars annually to the livestock producers of this country.

Mr. Burns then related how the commission firms at the various terminals were not permitted to file individual rates for selling livestock but were required to file their rates in bloc, and these rates were kept right up to the war-peak level while livestock prices are less than one-third what they were during the war. A bloc of commission firms has the stamp of governmental approval, while a farm bloc is condemned as bolshevistic, communistic, and sovietistic, but a business men's bloc is business.

Believing the rates charged by commission men for selling livestock were outrageously high, the farmers in the vicinity of one of the livestock terminals formed a cooperative selling agency and attempted to file a lower rate with the Department of Agriculture. Mr. Morrill, administrator of the packers and stockyards act, refused to receive the rates of this association in the following language:

In accordance with subdivision D of section 306 of the packers and stockyards act, tariff No. 1 of Producers' Commission Association for Kansas City has been rejected and refused for filing because it does not provide and give lawful notice of its effective date, as it was not filed in Washington until February 16, and purports to be effective February 22. Also, schedule departs from current market rates and would be suspended during pendency of proceedings involving reasonableness of Kansas City market rates if it had been properly filed.

But Mr. Morrill's legal department advised him that he had acted contrary to law; that the rates did provide lawful notice of their effectiveness and should have been received, filed, and permitted to become effective. Nevertheless, this agency has never been permitted to do business.

Later another cooperative agency was formed at another terminal. This agency was permitted to file its rates. These rates were lower than the old-line commission men were charging. But at once Mr. Morrill and his associates directed their guns against this concern and began arbitrating the question. Just what there was about this question to "arbitrate" I am not able to say, but it was "arbitrated" for weeks and weeks, with the final result that this association was permitted to do business at the same high rates charged by the old-line commission men. It is permitted, however, to declare patronage dividends, and it writes:

This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 12, and we are pleased to give you the information asked for, and it is open for publication. We, as a farmers' organization, owned and controlled by farmers, have no secrets. We will stand full investigation.

Total amount of commissions collected in 1923.....	\$265,000
Percentage of patronage dividend in 1923.....per cent.....	57
Total amount of patronage dividend in 1923.....	\$152,323

In the arbitration of this case I find this significant language in the report of the arbitrators:

6. No publicity shall be given to the information gathered by said arbitrators by either the complainants or defendants herein, and no public statement or interview with respect thereto given out unless by authority or direction of said arbitrators.

In other words, the public has no right to know how its business is being conducted. It has no right to know how its money is being expended. Everything must be done in some secret, mysterious way. Everything must be carried on just as big business conducts its affairs—behind closed doors in the dark.

Had the Department of Agriculture administered the packers and stockyards act as Congress intended it should be administered, had it encouraged competitive selling at the terminal markets by encouraging farmers' cooperative selling agencies on the basis of what the above cooperative agency is able to do, it would be a saving to the livestock producers of this country of over \$22,000,000 a year in lower selling rates.

But instead of the department encouraging competitive selling, it is stifling it. Instead of its protecting the farmers against the unlawful acts of commission men, it is protecting the commission men against the farmers.

It is true the department has done something toward putting a stop to "short changing," but this is perhaps overbalanced by the \$22,000,000 taken from the farmers in excessively high commission rates. It need not cost the Government \$410,500 to put a stop to "short changing," and no part of it should be used to protect the commission men against the farmer. They

have always done a pretty good job of protecting themselves. I am therefore opposed to increasing this appropriation.

In 1922 the livestock producers' organizations of the country filed a joint protest with Secretary Wallace against the wartime commission rates for selling livestock, urging him to exercise the authority Congress had given him to reduce them. On this point Mr. Burns said:

Had they not been hindered, obstructed, and deprived of their rights through Mr. Morrill's administration of the packers and stockyards act, I believe those rates would have been materially and substantially reduced long ago through competitive conditions. That arbitration proceeding was utterly illegal. There was not a shred of authority for it in the act. I say that, in my humble opinion, it has cost millions of dollars, and it has stabbed competition in the heart. That whole arbitration proceeding should be publicly repudiated and those rates should be gone into honestly and thoroughly by impartial minds. It is a duty the Government owes to 8 per cent at least of the producers of the country.

Mr. Burns condemned, in the strongest terms, the policy of Mr. Morrill in referring cases of crookedness of commission men to livestock exchanges for corrective action instead of exposing it to the light of day and proceeding according to law.

I set forth these facts as indicating that we are not getting our money's worth out of what we are already expending for administering the packers and stockyards act. Everything that the department has so far accomplished could be done for much less than we are now appropriating, and most of what the department is doing can be done for no appropriation at all. The commission men appear to be administering the act and they need no appropriation from Congress to do it. They fix their own selling charges and if these charges are not high enough the department encourages them to make them high enough. They can do that without the aid of Congress. When the commission men or packers lose stock they use the department supervisors as chore boys to find it. They can use their own chore boys for that purpose. When commission firms misrepresent the quality of a carload of cattle to the packer the supervisor is called upon to adjust the matter, when it should be a matter of adjustment between the interested parties. As Mr. Burns says, the department has diverted its funds from creating competitive conditions at the terminals to the stifling of competition; from protecting livestock producers against unlawful practices of commission firms to protecting the commission men against the producers. The departments should first see what it can do toward administering the act with the funds we are now giving it instead of trying to find ways to not administer it, and asking for more funds with which to do it.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, April 23, 1924, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

442. A letter from the Postmaster General transmitting claim of Mr. A. B. Ewing, postmaster at El Dorado, Kans., for credit on account of losses sustained in the burglary of the post office on December 5, 1923, with recommendation that authority be granted to credit said postmaster with \$29,895.00, and that appropriation be made therefor; to the Committee on Claims.

443. A letter from the Secretary of War transmitting a draft of proposed legislation "For the relief of sufferers from earthquake in Japan" (H. Doc. No. 242); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 8839. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 548). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAKER: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 5555. A bill to include certain lands in the county of Eldorado, Calif., in the Eldorado National Forest, Calif., and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 550). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CUMMINGS: Committee on the Territories. H. R. 5096. A bill to authorize the incorporated town of Sitka, Alaska, to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$25,000 for the purpose of constructing a public-school building in the town of Sitka, Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 549). Referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8220) granting an increase of pension to Sylvester B. Brott, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LEATHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 8835) authorizing appropriations from the reclamation fund to provide for the investigation and construction of certain Federal irrigation works; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 8836) to provide safeguards for future Federal irrigation development, and an equitable adjustment of existing accounts on Federal irrigation projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. McLEOD: A bill (H. R. 8837) to regulate the parking of vehicles in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. UPSHAW: A bill (H. R. 8838) providing for the election of Cabinet officers by the people; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 8839) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes; committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. YOUNG: A bill (H. R. 8840) to provide that jurisdiction shall be conferred upon the Court of Claims, notwithstanding the lapse of time or statutes of limitation, to hear, examine, and adjudicate and render judgment in any and all legal and equitable claims arising under or growing out of any treaty or agreement between the United States and certain bands of Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 8841) to prohibit the importation of certain hides and furs or packages thereof from Canada, unless marked so as to indicate the country of origin, and empowering certain State officers to inspect and mark such articles and packages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8842) to amend section 206 of the transportation act, 1920, approved February 28, 1920; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 8843) to authorize certain officers of the United States Marine Corps to accept from the Republic of Haiti "The medal for distinguished service"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 8844) to provide compensation in lieu of taxes for the several States with respect to certain lands of the United States within the borders of said States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 8845) to amend sections 20 and 21 of an act entitled "An act to prevent the manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquors in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1917, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BRAND of Georgia: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 250) to stimulate crop production in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TUCKER: Resolution (H. Res. 267) questioning the constitutionality of the treaty between the United States and Great Britain for the prevention of smuggling intoxicating liquors into the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KOPP: A bill (H. R. 8846) granting a pension to Rohama Crosley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAZARO: A bill (H. R. 8847) granting a pension to Catharine S. Wakefield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 8848) granting an increase of pension to Hester Thomas; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 8849) granting a pension to Almaria Hemstreet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEAVER: A bill (H. R. 8850) making an appropriation to compensate the Carolina Provision Co. for wood furnished the United States Government during the war; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 8851) granting a pension to Ida E. Wilkinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2492. By Mr. CHINDBLOM: Petition of Fred W. Alwart and 243 other citizens of Chicago, for repeal of all unfair war excise taxes, including tax on motor vehicles and parts therefor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2493. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the Harry Boland Council; also petition of the Patrick Henry-Joe McKelvey Council; also petition of the Christopher Farrell Council of the American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, praying the release of the Hon. Eamon De Valera; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2494. By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the Prairie Club, of Chicago, Ill., favoring the McNary-Clark bill (S. 1182 and H. R. 4830) for the reforestation of denuded areas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2495. Also, petition of the Illinois Manufacturers' Association, favoring House bills 4517 and 6357, relating to improvement of the foreign service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2496. Also, petition of the Illinois Association of Postmasters, favoring the Paige bill (H. R. 7016); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2497. By Mr. KVALE: Petition of Mr. Cuth Tibbetts, Linker Hotel, La Crosse, Wis., asking that he be given an opportunity to present to Congress alleged evidence of widespread nonenforcement of law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2498. Also, petition of Mrs. R. H. Doe and 239 other residents of Olivia, Minn., protesting against any modification of the national prohibition act that would legalize the use as beverages of beer, cider, and other alcoholic drinks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2499. By Mr. LEATHERWOOD: Petition of the Utah State Farm Bureau, Salt Lake City, Utah, favoring House bill 5563; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2500. By Mr. PATTERSON: Petition of 190 residents of Gloucester County, N. J., protesting against legalizing of 2.75 beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2501. Also, petition of 436 residents of Camden, N. J., protesting against legalizing 2.75 beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2502. By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of Ukrainian-American citizens of Boston, Mass., protesting against enactment of legislation requiring registration of alien workers in the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2503. By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of Maritime Association of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, favoring the improvement of harbor of refuge at Assateague, Va.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2504. By Mr. YOUNG: Petitions of Methodist Episcopal Church, Valley City, N. Dak.; Methodist Episcopal Church, LaMoure, N. Dak.; Woman's Club, Rugby, N. Dak.; Women's Foreign Missionary Society, Glover, N. Dak.; Mothers' Club, Crystal Springs, N. Dak.; Methodist Church of Dawson, N. Dak.; Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Crystal Springs, N. Dak.; Lutheran Ladies' Aid of Berwick, N. Dak.; Lutheran Ladies' Aid of Tunbridge, N. Dak.; Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Jamestown, N. Dak.; First Methodist Church of Jamestown, N. Dak.; First Baptist Church of Jamestown, N. Dak.; First Presbyterian Church of Jamestown, N. Dak.; First Congregational Church of Jamestown, N. Dak.; and Congregational Church of Valley City, N. Dak., against any modification of the Federal prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, April 23, 1924

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1924)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. HARRISON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Hollandale, in the State of Mississippi, praying for the passage of drastically restrictive immigration legislation with quotas based on the 1890 census, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. WILLIS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Washington Court House, Ohio, praying an amendment to the Constitution granting equal rights to women, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CAPPER presented the petition of the Home Missionary Society of the First Methodist Episcopal Church, of Topeka, Kans., praying an amendment to the Constitution regulating child labor, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ROBINSON presented a letter from John R. Kuhn, of Brooklyn, N. Y. (accompanied by newspaper clippings), in advocacy of an appeal to Congress for the passage of legislation guaranteeing a minimum price to producers of wheat and cotton, payable directly to the producers, upon delivery of the product at a Government agency, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD presented the petition of E. N. Melgard and 56 other citizens of Hart Township; of Nels Brusuth and 13 other citizens of New Hartford Township; of Henry Speltz and 28 other citizens of Norton; of G. M. Smith and 29 other citizens of St. Charles Township; of William J. Steckhansen and 18 other citizens of Mount Vernon Township; of H. H. Niemeyer and 15 other citizens of Homer Township; of Edward A. Campbell and 16 other citizens; of Frank W. Lucas and 23 other citizens; of Ed. J. Overland and 18 other citizens; all of Hart Township; of J. A. Snook and 19 other citizens of Dale Township; and of Glenn L. Ashcroft and 60 other citizens of Whitewater Township, all in the State of Minnesota, praying for the passage of the so-called McNary-Haugen export corporation bill, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented the memorial of Rev. Aug. Samuelson and 522 other citizens of Brainerd, Minn., remonstrating against the passage of legislation legalizing the manufacture and sale of 2.75 per cent beer, or otherwise modifying the so-called Volstead Prohibition Act, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petition of Howard E. Evans and 33 other citizens of Rochester, Minn., praying for the passage of legislation drastically restricting immigration, with quotas based on the census of 1890, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. CAMERON. I present a telegram from Mrs. R. L. Royal, department president of the American Legion Auxiliary, Department of Arizona, at Grand Canyon, relative to the soldiers' bonus bill, which I ask may be printed in the Record and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[Telegram]

GRAND CANYON, ARIZ., April 19, 1924.

Hon. RALPH CAMERON,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

The American Legion Auxiliary, Department of Arizona, urges your unqualified support adjusted compensation bill as reported by Senate Finance Committee. Urge you oppose any amendments from floor of Senate, particularly oppose cash option and that you support bill as reported. We will remember and appreciate this action.

Mrs. R. L. ROYAL,
Department President.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. LADD, from the Committee on Commerce, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 5218) granting the consent of Congress to the Pittsburgh Coal, Land & Railroad Co. to construct a bridge across the Tug Fork of Big Sandy River at or near Nolan, in Mingo County, W. Va., to the Kentucky side, in Pike County, Ky. (Rept. No. 451);